

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Leonard Hutchings; with amendments (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; with amendments (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; with amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of Max Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Thomas Sumner; with amendments (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Solomon Schlierman; with amendments (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Arnold Mecham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike; with amendments (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2393. A bill for the relief of Elsie Peter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1230).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2837. A bill for the relief of George Stiles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2993. A bill for the relief of William Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Paul Stanik; with amendments (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot; with amendments (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 382. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of State with reference to Tyler Kent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4718. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4719. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4720. A bill to amend the act of December 7, 1944, relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 4721. A bill to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4722. A bill to exempt from gross income for income-tax purposes certain earnings of honorably discharged veterans and his or her spouse and children under 18 years of age received since December 7, 1941, and re-

ceived during certain periods after discharge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4723. A bill for the relief of John M. Shipp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4724. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Sanford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4725. A bill for the relief of Alexander Michailovich Kalinin, Paul Loughbine, and Leon de Witt Ravadovsky; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4726. A bill for the relief of Frederick D. Ballou; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4727. A bill for the relief of R. R. Whitener; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4728. A bill for the relief of James Harold Pendley, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1329. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: A resolution of the Maine Woolen and Worsted Association adopted November 8 at their meeting held at the State House, Augusta, Maine, urging no action reducing present tariff schedules concerning the woolen and worsted industry until full opportunity is afforded all parties and this association in particular to be heard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1330. Also, petition of Adelbert A. Jameson and approximately 100 other citizens of Rockland, Maine, and vicinity, urging immediate action on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1331. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Resolution of the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, Johnstown, Pa., protesting against the expulsion of the Hungarian population from Czechoslovakia, by the provisional government of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1332. Also, a resolution of the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, Scalp Level, Pa., protesting against the expulsion of the Hungarian population from Czechoslovakia, by the provisional government of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Father Almighty, whose love will not let us go, outlasting all our stolid indifference, the resistless working of Thy eternal purpose beats ever against the stubborn self-willed barriers which we have set up. For this still moment may we hush all other sounds save the divine knocking and the entreating voice which says: "If any man will open the door, I

will come in." We know, O Spirit of Love and Purity, that when our heart's door swings on its hesitant hinges and Thou dost enter, those things which are unlovely and unclean cannot stay to embitter and pollute.

Come to us, we pray Thee, as refining fire to purge our inner lives from envy, hatred, prejudice, and malice. Suffer us not to let the sun go down upon our wrath. In a mad and violent day, may we walk and work in the peace that the world giveth not, in the charity that thinketh no evil, in the good will that bridges all chasms; and when the sunset comes, may we face its summons with an approving conscience void of offense toward Thee and our fellow man. We ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 16, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 17, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 562) for the relief of Klau-Van Pieterse-Dunlap Associates, Inc.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) authorizing the printing as a public document the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income-tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940:

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor:

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 16, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate Tuesday and Wednesday because of my absence from the city with the Senate's Special Atomic Bomb Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following-named Senators, who are members of the Atomic Energy Committee, may be absent for 2 days from sessions of the Senate, to proceed to Oak Ridge, Tenn., on an inspection trip: The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate on tomorrow, Tuesday, and on the following day, Wednesday, in order to attend meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee which will be held outside Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent tomorrow and on the day following in order to attend a meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee at Oak Ridge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent on the same days in order to attend meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

THE ITEM VETO—RESULTS OF GALLUP POLL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a recent Gallup poll which shows very substantial approval throughout the country for the item veto, a proposal which I have repeatedly presented to the Senate and which is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I should like to add that President Roosevelt in a letter to the Senate in his lifetime endorsed the item veto. I should like further to add that President Truman has endorsed it. I ask that the Gallup poll upon this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL

PRINCETON, N. J., November 15.—Americans ordinarily take a very cautious attitude

toward changing traditional procedures of government, but there is one reform proposed by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, which appeals to a substantial majority of voters.

Senator VANDENBERG's proposal would authorize a President to veto specific items in appropriation bills.

At present, under the Constitution, the White House must approve or veto any bill as a whole. This makes congressional logrolling combinations possible and enables Members to get their pet schemes adopted by tacking them onto appropriation bills as riders, since the President cannot veto parts of a bill.

The Vandenberg proposal to change this system was put before a cross-section of the voters of the country in an institute poll as follows:

"At the present time when Congress passes a bill to spend money, the President cannot veto parts of that bill but must accept it in full or veto it. Do you think this should be changed so that the President can veto some items in a bill to spend money without vetoing the entire bill?"

The vote of the public follows:

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes..... | 57 |
| No..... | 14 |
| No opinion..... | 29 |

The Vandenberg proposal, introduced in the Senate and now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was in the form of a resolution to submit to the States a constitutional amendment authorizing a President to veto parts of appropriation bills.

Many students of government have long felt that the system was in need of reform. The principle of the Vandenberg proposal has been in effect for some time in several State governments, including New York.

The idea is a nonpartisan one so far as voters themselves are concerned. Both Democrats and Republicans polled in the sample support the proposed reform by about the same majority.

Overwhelming approval is found among voters with opinions in every education group.

An analysis of attitudes by political party and by education follows:

| | Yes | No | No opinion |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|
| By party: | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Democrats..... | 59 | 12 | 29 |
| Republicans..... | 56 | 20 | 24 |
| By education: | | | |
| College..... | 70 | 20 | 10 |
| High school..... | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Grade school or no school..... | 49 | 12 | 39 |

INABILITY OF KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO. TO FURNISH TRUCK PARTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram which the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. of Detroit sent to all its patrons:

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

We regret to inform you that as of today we are discontinuing shipments of all original equipment truck parts. This decision is necessary due to the delay of the Government agency, the Automotive Branch, OPA, in acting on price relief or suspension for these parts. Until some action is taken by this agency by which we can recover in our selling prices the increased labor and material costs we have been compelled to add since March 1942, we will be unable to serve you.

KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO.

Mr. President, the message speaks for itself.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Austin | Gurney | Murdock |
| Ball | Hart | Myers |
| Barkley | Hatch | O'Daniel |
| Bilbo | Hawkes | O'Mahoney |
| Brewster | Hayden | Radcliffe |
| Bridges | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Buck | Hill | Revercomb |
| Bushfield | Hoey | Robertson |
| Butler | Huffman | Russell |
| Byrd | Johnson, Colo. | Shipstead |
| Capper | Johnston, S. C. | Smith |
| Carville | Knowland | Stewart |
| Chavez | La Follette | Taft |
| Connally | Lucas | Taylor |
| Cordon | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Donnell | McClellan | Tunnell |
| Downey | McFarland | Tydings |
| Eastland | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Ellender | McMahon | Wagner |
| Ferguson | Maybank | Walsh |
| Fulbright | Mead | Wheeler |
| George | Millikin | White |
| Gerry | Mitchell | Wiley |
| Green | Moore | Wilson |
| Guffey | Morse | Young |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a complete set of laws passed by the Municipal

Councils and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT RELATING TO COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—RESOLUTION OF WAKE FOREST (N. C.) COLLEGE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the faculty of Wake Forest College, North Carolina, in regular session November 12, 1945, relating to the development and control of atomic energy.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE,
Wake Forest, N. C.

We, the faculty of Wake Forest College, aware of the tremendous import of atomic energy and atomic weapons to all mankind, believe that the security of the United States can be achieved only through international cooperation for the joint control of these new forces. We believe that a policy of secret research and exclusive national control can only result in a ruinous competitive armaments race in which all the nations of the world will join, leading to the danger of a new and catastrophic world war. From such a war no people will emerge free, if indeed they survive at all.

We therefore resolve and urge:

1. That the United States as the country that has opened the way for the development of atomic energy, should immediately invite the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent competitive armaments and consider the problems arising from this overwhelming development.

2. That the United States champion the need for international development with the broadest utilization of all resources and the widest freedom of research and interchange of ideas.

We believe furthermore that any legislative effort which stifles free and open scientific investigation, which seeks to prevent public surveillance and criticism of the application of atomic energy will stifle scientific progress, undermine peace and is therefore harmful to the national interest.

We therefore urge Congress:

1. That legislative action for the control of atomic energy be preceded by full, free, and public discussion.

2. That the authority for the guidance of the development of atomic energy shall consist of men of scientific competence, fully compensated for their services and able to work toward the maximum utilization of atomic energy for the welfare of the public and not for the interests of any special group.

3. That the administrator chosen to direct the work of such an authority be a civilian.

4. That security regulations be limited to direct military application of atomic power and that free research and right of publication be immediately resumed in the field of atomic physics.

Passed by the faculty of Wake Forest College in regular session November 12, 1945.

E. B. EARNSHAW,
Secretary.

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM ORMAL L. MILLER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Rev. Ormal L. Miller, pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Topeka, Kans., expressing his opposition to peacetime compulsory military training. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Topeka, Kans., November 8, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I want to register a very emphatic protest against the program for compulsory military training which is being proposed. In my judgment it is a serious mistake with far-reaching consequences for the future.

It should be very apparent to us by this time that military power is a very dangerous factor in the life of any nation. It does not provide security, as witness the plight first of France, and later of Germany. It inevitably creates tensions and suspicions which sooner or later result in trouble.

The military leaders of the Nation have demonstrated their ability to prosecute a successful war, but I refuse to grant them superior insight into the way to maintain peace. It is my belief that we will make a fatal mistake to permit them to influence the future course of the Nation. We have fought two tragic wars to rid the world of militarism, and now having decisively crushed militarism in Germany and Japan, it seems unbelievable that we will assume the same role which has brought them to disaster.

Reference has been made to our responsibility to the future youth of the Nation. It seems to me we have a very great responsibility to the youth of this generation, and of a generation ago, who have made a great sacrifice to rid the world of this curse. Our greatest contribution to future generations will not be military regimentation, but vigorous and sacrificial efforts to establish vital agencies of peace and international cooperation.

The training of large armies is not our problem. At the time of Pearl Harbor we had many men in training, but industry was not in production to supply them. I am convinced that any real emergency will be met adequately by civilian armies if need be, provided atomic power has not produced catastrophe first. We confront a new phase of international history, and it is fatal to attempt to carry out-moded methods into the future. Rather let us be adventurous in building understanding, brotherhood, and creative agencies of peaceful cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ORMAL L. MILLER.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—LETTER FROM CABINET OF WICHITA (KANS.) COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from the cabinet of the Wichita (Kans.) Council of Churches relating to the United Nations Charter.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Wichita, Kans., November 14, 1945.

HON. CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: The United Nations Charter has been ratified with unprecedented speed. The peoples of the earth are pinning high hopes on this important organization. If the United States and Russia and Great Britain will collaborate, UNO will wield an important force in world affairs, but, of these three, the moral leadership rests primarily with the United States.

In reality, if the United States takes the wise course, the other nations of the world will follow our leadership and UNO will succeed. If we follow the wrong course, it will fail. To make it succeed, the wisest step for the United States is to precede all decisions that have international implications by consultation with the other nations through UNO.

Such questions as universal military training, the control of atomic energy, the government of vanquished peoples, the disposal of colonies, the establishment of bases, and such, if decided by ourselves, in isolation, will provoke rivalry. But if we will discuss them with the United Nations before taking action, there will be a spirit of confidence and the foundation of peace.

We urge that you be alert to use the offices of the UNO in every proper international matter. We urge that you resist the passage of acts that have bearing on international relations prior to report of our UNO delegates as to the understandings they have been able to secure. If we can hold enactment of universal military training and similar matters in abeyance pending an attempted agreement among the nations, it may be possible to eliminate many costly policies.

Let us get away from bloc action as far as possible. Let us try the democratic way among the nations—full and free discussion, full publicity, full cooperation. This is the most hopeful course for the future.

Respectfully,

CABINET OF THE WICHITA
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES.

RALPH E. LIGHTNER, *President*.
JOHN W. MELOY, *Secretary*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1152. A bill to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 750).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 1289. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 751).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 7. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; with an amendment (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 608. A bill to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 753).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1604. A bill for the relief of Leo Stuhr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1605. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. Murray) introduced Senate bill 1606, to provide for a national health program, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1607. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Peter Kim; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of William A. Gallagher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1609. A bill for the relief of Catherin Gilbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1610. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT OF 1946—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 28, line 12, insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds remaining available for advance base construction, material, and equipment, not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be available toward reconstruction of the civilian economy of Guam."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Ansgar Lutheran, of November 12, 1945, entitled "Universal Military Training," and a letter which I have received from a member of the armed forces at Camp Gordon, Ga., dated October 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

President Truman has spoken. He asks us to introduce universal military training. We must do the same as they have done in Europe in the past. But what has happened to the nations who had universal training? They are now prostrate in the dust. Germany, Japan, Italy, France. The nations, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, that were not prepared for war, won the war.

Is that the way of the world? Does it mean that he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword? Jesus did say something about that, and He should be an authority worth listening to even in Washington. Oswald

Spengler pictured the nations with strong military regimes as nations that would finally be defeated. He did this in his book *The Decline of the West*. He was right.

What is it that makes a nation strong? Would it be out of the way to quote Psalm 20: 7-8? "Some trust in chariots and some in horses; but we will make mention of the name of Jehovah our God. They are bowed down and fallen; but we are risen and stand upright."

Whenever civilization gets to depend upon mechanical things alone, it is doomed.

Universal military training will change our whole national outlook. It will make us develop a military spirit. What effect will that have upon our national life? It will be the military men who will decide our policies. Have we not constantly condemned the military clique of Japan, and the military men of Prussia? Are we now to begin to develop that which we have just defeated and which we are just placing on trial both in Japan and Germany?

Let us give peace a chance. The common man is sick of war. He was made to sacrifice for war, he will gladly sacrifice for peace, but he must be shown the way.

What do our leaders think universal training can do for us? It certainly cannot prepare our souls for national emergencies. It never could. History proves the very opposite.

And the atomic bomb. An atomic bomb may be planted secretly in 50 of our big cities and let off as a time bomb, so these cities will be wiped out in 12 hours. History teaches us that spiritually decadent people always lose. No spiritually weak people can win no matter what weapon they get. Germany proved that. She lost because she had lost her soul. Only the strong Christian can survive.

We know that the advocates of the universal training will say, keep your powder dry. But no powder is ever dry if Christianity is forgotten.

Sometimes we have thought all men sent to Congress should first have a heavy course in history and Christianity before they are sworn into office. We must get to see that the things men live by are not the mechanical things, it is the things of God.

CAMP GORDON, GA., October 29, 1945.

HON. HUGH BUTLER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the present time when questions of the utmost importance in regard to the future welfare of the United States are being debated and a decision must be made I feel it is the duty of every citizen to make known his ideas to the elected legislators of the country.

I am deeply concerned about the peacetime military training program. My 2 years' service in the Army have convinced me that 1 year of military training will not materially increase our national strength militarily. The stupid tasks of picking up cigarette butts, match sticks, etc., do not teach our soldiers the functions of warfare. To use the Army's own act as a reason; 17 weeks' training was considered sufficient to fit a man for combat; why is it they are now asking 52 weeks' training, three times as much?

I think one of the determining factors in our recent victory was numerical superiority in personnel, planes, guns, and all types of matériel.

And here is a very vital point that we should keep in mind: peacetime conscription for military training does deny the individuals affected the rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. If we allow this one encroachment upon our freedom are we not opening the door to those who would like to further subject us by restrictions of our personal freedom? I be-

lieve the recent events pertaining to demobilization clearly indicate the potential threat against that freedom as we have always known it.

I do not want to rear my son to be a number in the Army against his will. I feel it is his birthright to have the decision of his life, insofar as it does not transgress upon the rights of his fellow men, in his own hands during peacetime.

However we must have national defense and I sincerely believe a larger Regular Army and Navy, and expanded National Guard, ROTC, with perhaps, a new branch of training at the junior high school or high school to create an enlisted men reserve, but keep the entire program on a voluntary basis.

When our civilization reaches the point where we will not voluntarily defend ourselves, families, country, and way of life then our civilization will have reached a point where it ceases to be worth the sacrifice of armed defense. And at this point may I ask: are all the proponents of peacetime military training on a compulsory basis thinking of defense and only defense? Two years' Army service will cause a freedom-loving American to ask many questions.

I also believe the time-consuming factor in our present defense system is not the mobilization of military personnel, as illustrated by the Army 17 weeks' training program in conjunction with a Regular Army as cadre and a reserve of officers and enlisted men, but rather in the field of matériel, the time lag in manufacturing new war goods. For an illustration, our present equipment will be obsolete in a few years if it is not already obsolete due to the atomic bomb. Our best defense lies in the hands of a few scientific men and industrialists. A group of these men constantly working on new military weapons, in complete cooperation with the military, and simultaneously formulating production plans that will successfully tie in with our industrial set-up. And here is another point worth mentioning, can we take steps that will insure the acceptance and fair trial by the military of new or revolutionary matériel, methods, etc.? We do not want any Gen. Billy Mitchell type episodes in the future.

I have expressed my opinion as a citizen of the United States who is deeply concerned about the future and hope you will consider it as such.

Sincerely,

GERMAN BUSINESS STILL A MENACE— ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "German Business—Still a Menace," written by Senator THOMAS of Utah and published in the November 1945 issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD COOPERATION—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, at the mayor's dinner at the Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S. C., in connection with the Jimmy Byrnes Homecoming Day, November 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RED CROSS—ARTICLE BY AGNES E. MEYER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Red Cross, written by Agnes E. Meyer, and published in the Washington Post of November 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITIQUE OF LABOR LAW—ADDRESS BY PROF. WILLIAM STERNBERG

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address

entitled "Critique of Labor Law," delivered by Prof. William Sternberg, of Creighton University School of Law, Omaha, Nebr., before the Postwar Institute of the Nebraska Bar Association on October 31, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO AN ATHLETE DYING YOUNG—SERMON BY REV. ALLEN PENDERGRAFT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "To an Athlete Dying Young," delivered by Rev. Allen Pendergraft on November 4, 1945, at All Saints Church, Buffalo, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters received by him on the subject of universal military training, which appear in the Appendix.]

DELAY IN DISCHARGING SERVICEMEN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three letters addressed to him on the subject of the discharge of servicemen, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR CHILDREN—POEM BY EDWARD T. PACA

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Our Children," written by Edward T. Paca, of Englewood, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 380)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

(For President's message see p. 10817 of the House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill which I send to the desk and request that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill proposes to establish a national health program along the lines set forth by the President in his message on this subject just read. Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1606) to provide for a national health program, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in 1939 I introduced a national health bill, which was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill was given a favorable report by a subcommittee, but because of the war no action was taken.

In 1940, I, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], introduced a hospi-

tal construction bill. The bill was reported out favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor and passed by the Senate.

During the past 5 years I have continued to study very carefully the entire health problem. The bill introduced today is an improved bill. It is the result of the constructive suggestions of many outstanding medical authorities and of labor, farm, consumer, and health organizations interested in improving the Nation's health.

The need for a national health program has been proved many times. In restating the need I should like to quote from a statement, Principles of a Nation-Wide Health Program, issued last year by 29 leading health experts, including 13 outstanding doctors. Here is what these experts said:

American medicine at its best is unsurpassed but it is also beyond doubt that the medical facilities and services actually available to many of our people are far below the best. There have been great achievements of the American medical profession, American hospitals, public health and welfare agencies in providing care for sickness, educating personnel, advancing medical knowledge, reducing and preventing disease. Nevertheless unmet needs for medical care are widespread and the burdens of sickness costs are heavy and sometimes overwhelming. There has been a gratifying reduction in the death rate, but the lowering of death rates is not an adequate measure of the extent to which medical care is available or needed. Moreover, the fact that death and disease rates are much greater in some States than in others, and greater among low than among high-income groups, demonstrates that there are still needs and opportunities.

Medical services should be made financially accessible to all through a national system of contributory health insurance, combined with taxation in behalf of people without sufficient income, preventive services and needed extensions and improvements of all facilities. In order that comprehensive service shall be available to all or most of the population and in order to minimize the administrative costs of acquiring members, it is essential that financial participation in the system be required by law. The contribution for medical-care insurance will not mean an added burden on the earnings of workers. The American people are now spending for physicians' services and hospitalization enough to provide for all with only minor supplementation, if these payments are regularized, instead of falling with disastrous uncertainty. Place should be maintained for voluntary action by many agencies as well as for action by our national, State, and local governments.

The same basic facts and proposals were contained in the official statement of policy on Medical Care in a National Health Program adopted in October 1944 by the American Public Health Association. Here is what that association said in its official statement:

I. A large portion of the population receives insufficient and inadequate medical care, chiefly because persons are unable to pay the costs of services on an individual-payment basis when they are needed, or because the services are not available.

II. There are extensive deficiencies in the physical facilities needed to provide reasonably adequate services. Such facilities include hospitals, health centers, and laboratories. The needs are most acute in poor communities, in rural areas, and in urban areas where the population has increased

rapidly or where the development of facilities has been haphazard or the financial support inadequate.

III. There are extensive deficiencies in the number and the distribution of personnel needed to provide the services. Here again, the needs vary according to categories of personnel and to characteristics of communities.

IV. There are extensive deficiencies in the number and categories of personnel qualified to administer facilities and services.

V. Many communities still are not served by public health departments; others inadequately maintain such departments. Thus, some communities have never utilized organized health work to reduce the burden of illness, and others share its benefits only in part. In these communities especially, people lack information on the benefits of modern medical care.

VI. Expansion of scientific research is urgently needed. Despite past and current scientific advances, knowledge as to the prevention, control, or cure of many diseases is lacking.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HEALTH PROVISIONS

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced includes five provisions which will make available basic health services to all the people wherever they may live and whatever their income may be.

First, the present Federal grants-in-aid to the States for public-health services are broadened and increased to speed up the progress of preventive and community-wide health services. It should therefore be possible, over a period of years, to assure that essential public-health services are available in all parts of the country, especially the rural areas which are so sadly in need of such services.

Second, the community-wide maternal and child-health services, aided by Federal grants to the States, are similarly broadened and strengthened.

Third, Federal grants-in-aid to the States are authorized for meeting the costs of medical care for needy persons.

At the present time there are 3,000,000 needy persons receiving cash assistance grants under Federal-State public assistance programs. However, Federal funds under existing laws cannot be used to match State or local expenditures which are made directly to doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, or other medical agencies.

By authorizing Federal grants to the States for meeting these direct medical expenditures, more adequate medical care will be made available to these persons; and hospitals and practitioners will receive more adequate compensation for their services.

Fourth, prepaid medical care is made available.

All four of the provisions which I have just mentioned will greatly help to round out the health services of the Nation. By preventing sickness, disability and premature death, they will pay vast dividends in human welfare and, at the same time, reduce the costs of other public and private welfare programs. Unless we provide a method of spreading the cost of medical and hospital care, people will still not obtain the treatment they need.

Fifth, grants-in-aid are provided under the prepaid medical care plan to non-profit institutions engaging in research or in professional education.

These 5 provisions are essential to the development of a broad national health program. They must, however, be supplemented by other provisions in order to assure a truly comprehensive national health program.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record as a part of my remarks the remainder of my statement, including questions and answers on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE PREPAID MEDICAL CARE PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1945

1. Does the prepaid medical care title of the bill provide for "socialized medicine?"

No; if by the term "socialized medicine" is meant medical care furnished by Government doctors free of charge. The term "socialized medicine" has been loosely used for a number of years to describe any changes in the provision of medical services to which the American Medical Association leadership is opposed. The only definition of "socialize" in Webster's Dictionary which describes the effect of the bill on medical practice is "to adapt to social needs or uses." This title II of the bill will accomplish by making medical services more generally available than they are today, while retaining free choice of doctor for the patient and freedom on the doctor's part to work under the system or to remain out of it as he prefers. If it is charged that the bill proposes to make medical services more generally available than they are today, that charge is valid and is a compliment to the bill.

2. If, as Dr. Fishbein declares in his editorials in the Journal of the American Medical Association, health conditions and the standards of medical service are higher in the United States than anywhere else in the world, why is a change necessary?

The United States is not the healthiest country in the world. Dr. Fishbein presents a very favorable over-all picture but he neglects to state that conditions are not nearly so satisfactory in poor agricultural States, in rural regions of wealthy States, in low-income sections of our large cities, and among low-income groups in our population. Take, for example, the infant and maternal mortality rates. In 1942, while 40 babies in the entire United States died at birth for every 1,000 born alive, in 1 State the rate was 98, and 80 in another.

We find similar wide variation in maternal mortality rates. The rate for mothers who died in childbirth was 60 percent higher in the Southern States than in New England. The number of Negro mothers who died when their babies were born was twice the number of white mothers. Twenty-five percent more mothers died in towns and villages with less than 10,000 population than in the cities with population of 100,000 or more.

We are proud of our steady reduction in deaths from tuberculosis. Here again, however, the over-all favorable picture conceals many inequalities. In New York City one over-crowded district has a death rate from this cause which is 30 times the rate in more favored districts. The highest tuberculosis mortality rates for several States are four to five times the average in the States with the best records.

Probably few people would have believed, 6 years ago, that more than half of our young men would be found physically or mentally unfit for general military duty. Yet that is exactly what was revealed by Selective Service examination records of the first 3,000,000 registrants. Soon after the early days of the war, certain of the physical standards were relaxed. Nevertheless, recent figures from

Selective Service still show the appalling fact that 50 percent of the young men examined were either completely unable to perform general military service or were made fit only after correction of defects. Out of 14,000,000 men (most of them under 30) examined by June 1, 1944, 4,500,000 were classified as IV-F, unfit for military service despite the lowered physical and mental requirements for military service; more than 1,000,000 after being inducted were later discharged for defects which became apparent after induction; and 1,500,000 were inducted but made fit for service only after certain defects had been corrected—giving a total of 7,000,000 that were initially unfit. Another fact stands out from the Selective Service figures: 1,500,000 of the 7,000,000 unfit were rehabilitated for military service readily and the numbers of such rehabilitated cases could have been easily doubled, indicating that with adequate medical care the proportion of unfit would have been much less.

Length of life is often considered a measure of the health of the people. Yet statistics of life expectancy for males in prewar years showed a number of countries in which the average future length of life was greater than in the United States. For example: At birth, life expectancy in at least 4 countries was better than that for white males in the United States; at age 20, life expectancy in 8 countries exceeded that in the United States; at age 60, the United States was exceeded by at least 12 countries.

Most of these are health insurance countries. In the United States, inability to pay the costs of medical care prevents many people from receiving the care they need and limits doctors in the kind and amount of care they can provide. People who don't see a doctor don't get any kind of care—good or bad. Many doctors are unable or unequipped, because of the cost to the patient, to make use of the marvels of medical science which are described so glowingly by some medical spokesmen. Patients of these doctors get a type of medical care not much better than that their fathers and grandfathers received.

3. Is it true that if the prepayment provisions of the bill are enacted into law "they will destroy the private practice of medicine in the United States"?

This statement is not true. If the bill is enacted into law, physicians will continue to practice medicine much as they do now. They will have the choice of practicing full time under the system, of combining care of patients paid for by the system with care of uninsured patients and of those who prefer to pay for their care privately (that is, without making use of their prepaid protection), or of continuing to practice full time outside the system. Whether caring for prepaid patients or for others, they will be free, as they are now, to practice alone or as members of a group.

Patients will be free to choose their general practitioners and to change them if their first choice proves unsatisfactory. Doctors will be equally free to accept or reject patients who choose them. Free choice is explicitly guaranteed in the bill (sec. 205).

4. Is it true that under the bill the "entire medical profession in the United States would be placed under the direction of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service"?

No. This is not true. Section 203 in the bill, which relates to administration, is concerned not with the administration of medical practice but with the administration of a system of paying for medical care.

The provisions in the bill do not interfere with the professional aspects of medical practice. The Surgeon General is "authorized to negotiate and periodically to renegotiate agreements or cooperative working arrangements" with the medical profession and with hospitals to "utilize their services and facilities and to pay fair, reasonable, and equitable compensation for such service and facilities."

The usual method of making payments to general practitioners is to be that which is chosen by the majority of physicians in any given local areas. However, provision is also made that, if approved by the Surgeon General, other methods of payment may be made to physicians who do not choose the method of the majority. It should be noted that the Surgeon General wouldn't hire doctors for the prepaid services or direct the medical profession. He is authorized to work out mutually satisfactory agreements or cooperative working arrangements with the doctors as to methods by which they would be paid for their services to insured persons. The same holds true for methods of payment to dentists.

In adopting the basic policies that would guide these arrangements, the Surgeon General is required to consult with the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, on which the medical and dental profession will be adequately represented through members they nominate.

5. It is said that the National Advisory Medical Policy Council will have no authority—will be merely a puppet council. Is this true?

No. This is not true. The council has been given no final administrative authority, because an advisory council is not and should not be an administrative body. An explicit statement in the bill which bound the Surgeon General to follow the advice of the advisory council in every instance would hamper his freedom of action to an unreasonable extent and would deprive him of the necessary authority to carry out his duties and responsibilities. He is, however, bound to consult them on all matters of policy. The bill is explicit and detailed in its description of the administrative policies on which the Surgeon General is authorized to act, only after consultation with the council (section 205).

In appointing the members of the advisory council, the Surgeon General is required to select them from panels of names submitted by professional and other agencies and organizations concerned with medical, dental, and nursing services and education, with the operation of hospitals and laboratories, and from other persons, agencies, or organizations informed on the need for or provision of medical, hospital, or related services and benefits. It will, therefore, be a council composed of experts in the various fields and of representatives of the public. No responsible administrator would dare to act contrary to the advice of an advisory council of this character on any matter of importance unless he had adequate grounds on which he could defend his position publicly. Moreover, the Surgeon General is required to include in his annual report to Congress an account of his consultations with the advisory council, and also their recommendations and his comments thereon.

6. Isn't \$3,000,000,000 a year an enormous amount of money to spend on medical care and hospitalization?

Absolutely not. We spend more than this now for all medical care. The sums of money to be allocated to the personal health services account will not for the most part represent new expenditures. To the extent that they do—through budgeted expenditures—the people will receive much more service than they do today.

Medical care ordinarily costs the people of this country in direct payments and through taxation about four to five billion dollars a year. Direct expenditures by the people themselves amount to about three to four billion dollars. About two to two and one-half billion dollars is spent in an ordinary nonwar year for medical services excluding dentistry and home nursing.

7. Is it true that the Surgeon General will assign all patients to all doctors?

Certainly not. In each area patients will have free choice of all general practitioners

of medicine or dentistry within the system (sec. 205 (b)).

8. Will the hospitalization provisions in the bill destroy the voluntary hospital system?

No; this is nonsense. Nothing in the bill provides for or would even permit any interference in the internal management of any hospitals—private, public, or sectarian. This is explicitly forbidden in the bill (sec. 206 (c)). All hospitals which meet acceptable standards—such standards as those utilized by the American Medical Association or the American College of Surgeons in determining whether or not hospitals shall be included in its annual register—would as a matter of course be included in the list of hospitals eligible to receive insured patients. In communities where hospital facilities are sparse there will undoubtedly be commonsense modification of these standards. There is explicit provision in the bill for this (sec. 214 (k)). The object is to make hospital care more available to people—not less available.

Each qualified hospital is also guaranteed the right to choose how it will be paid. The hospital can be paid direct under a mutually satisfactory agreement. Or it can be paid by the patient, who receives his benefit in cash at so many dollars per day of hospital care (sec. 214 (h)).

The assurance of adequate income should enable hospitals to improve their facilities. The type of records which will be required will be no more difficult for hospitals to keep—perhaps less difficult—than those required by the Blue Cross plans.

9. Will the provisions for grants-in-aid for medical education mean that medical education will be controlled by the Surgeon General and that he will dictate which men and women may become medical students?

Of course not. The provisions of section 213 of the bill give the Surgeon General no such authority. The purpose of this provision is to provide needed funds for the stimulation and support of research and medical education. Projects must be initiated by the medical schools and research foundations themselves. Such requests must, of course, be approved by the Surgeon General after consultation with the advisory council, to make sure that public funds are wisely spent.

This provision was put in the bill as a result of suggestions made by the medical profession in regard to the earlier Wagner health bill of 1939. It seems only proper that the people who profit so much by the advancements of medical science and improvements in medical education should contribute in this way to these desirable ends.

10. Is it true that the bill would be used to "take over" medical schools and hospitals?

Of course not. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which would authorize or even permit this. Nothing in the bill permits interference in the internal management of either medical schools or hospitals. The payment of hospital benefits to hospitals and of grants-in-aid to medical schools will provide a financial security that many institutions have never before possessed. This assurance of necessary funds should strengthen and stimulate them to do more effective work than they have ever done before, without in any way giving up independence and freedom of action.

11. Is it true that the enactment of the bill will plunge the physicians into political slavery?

Absolutely no. This statement has been made by opponents of a national prepayment plan to confuse and disturb physicians and others. There is nothing "political" about the office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General holds a term appointment. The United States Public Health Service has a long and honorable record of almost 150 years. Many of the advances in public health which the

editorials in certain medical journals credit to the private practitioners of medicine have been stimulated by the activities of the Public Health Service and by similar public agencies.

12. Is it true that under the hospitalization provisions of the bill people will not be able to choose their hospitals?

People do not usually have free choice of hospitals today. Ordinarily, they go to the hospital in which the physician treating them has a staff appointment. Sometimes they have a choice of two or more hospitals in the community. They will have the same freedom under the provisions of the bill. They will have as much free choice of hospitals as they have today under the Blue Cross plans. All hospitals in good standing will undoubtedly elect to receive insured patients in order to obtain the assurance of guaranteed income which will thus be available to them.

13. Will people be obliged to take any doctor the Surgeon General tells them to, if this bill becomes law?

Certainly not. The bill expressly provides free choice of general practitioners (sec. 205 (b)). Ordinarily, a patient will go to a specialist only on the recommendation of his physician. This is for the protection of the patient. Most people should see a general practitioner first before they go to a specialist. The patient who goes to a specialist on the advice of a physician is likely to be taken care of more satisfactorily than if he follows the suggestion of a neighbor or picks out a name in the telephone book. The same statements apply to dentists.

14. The bill says the Surgeon General can limit the number of patients a physician will be allowed to treat. Won't that keep people from having the doctor of their choice?

Not any more than at present when a patient chooses a doctor who already has all the patients he can take care of. This provision in the bill (sec. 205 (j)) is merely permissive. It states that the "Surgeon General may prescribe maximum limits to the number of potential beneficiaries for whom a practitioner or group of practitioners may undertake to furnish general medical benefits * * *". It does not require the Surgeon General to do so. Protection of patients and doctors was the only purpose in giving the Surgeon General permission to set a maximum. Such a maximum would undoubtedly be the largest number of persons whom one doctor could take care of satisfactorily. It would therefore be a larger number than doctors ordinarily take care of. As a result, this provision, if the Surgeon General found it wise to use it, would rarely, if ever, interfere with the guaranteed freedom of insured persons to choose their own doctors.

15. Does the bill place in the hands of one man—the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—the power and authority * * * to designate which doctors can be specialists?

Questions like this one confuse and disturb physicians and the public because they can be answered by neither a flat "yes" nor a flat "no." Under the prepaid program, specialists would be compensated at a higher rate than general practitioners. This is only fair and proper. To provide a measure for determining what types of services and which practitioners should be compensated at this higher rate, the Surgeon General is authorized in the bill to set up general standards for this purpose. In establishing these standards, he must, however, consult the advisory council and utilize standards and certifications already developed by physicians through their professional organizations.

16. Will the enactment of the bill result in the deterioration of medical practice?

On the contrary, it should improve the standards of medical practice. Many doctors are hampered today in their treatment

of patients by the inability of the patient to pay for the special diagnostic and treatment services he requires. The provisions for consultant and specialist services, for hospital care, and for X-ray and laboratory services as benefits under the bill will mean that doctors can make use of these services whenever they consider it advisable, without considering the patient's pocketbook.

17. Doesn't the phrase giving the Surgeon General the authority to "prescribe and publish such rules and regulations," used in section 203 (f) of the bill, mean that the Surgeon General will have too much power?

This phrase has been frequently quoted to convey just this impression. But no administrator can administer a national prepayment plan without setting up certain rules and regulations. It is a phrase commonly used in bills. It has no sinister significance. It merely gives the administrator the power to establish necessary administrative measures. He is specifically forbidden from using the "rules and regulations" to act contrary to the other provisions of the bill.

18. It has been said that if the bill becomes law people must depend upon "a doctor who is paid by the Government and is presumably working 8 hours a day instead of 24." Won't this make it very hard for people to get a doctor if they need one at night or on holidays?

Certainly not. Any such idea is nonsense and an insult to the medical profession. There is not one statement in the bill which even implies that doctors are to work any specified number of hours. Many a doctor who answers a patient's call today has no idea when or whether he will be paid for his services. Why should we assume that doctors will look after their patients less conscientiously when they know they will be paid than they do today when payment is often uncertain?

19. Is it true that, under a system of prepaid medical care, physicians will have lower incomes than they have now?

With 60,000 physicians in the armed services during the war, of course, those left in private practice have been overworked and their incomes have been very high. They would not be so high in an ordinary year. If the question really means "will physicians have lower incomes under the bill than they usually have" the answer certainly is "no." Before the war, the highest average gross income physicians ever made was in 1928 or 1929—again years when all incomes were unusually high. In those years physicians earned on the average about \$9,000 gross, but in the years since then and before the war their average incomes have been from \$5,600 to \$8,500 gross.

It is estimated that on the average \$1,500,000,000 annually could be spent for physicians' services. At this rate, if 150,000 physicians were in full-time practice, they would average about \$10,000 income in a normal year under the bill. Like the previous figures, this includes incomes of both general practitioners and specialists. The general practitioner earns less than the specialist and, as the bill provides, the qualified specialist will continue to receive a higher rate of pay than the general practitioner. Thus, specialists as a whole would receive more than the \$10,000 average, and general practitioners as a whole somewhat less than the average.

20. It is claimed by opponents of a national plan that voluntary prepayment plans could do the job as well, if not better. Is this true?

Experience here and abroad has shown us that voluntary plans could not handle the job. You can't persuade enough people, much less the bulk of the people, to join voluntary plans. Moreover, the voluntary plans which have been operating so far are too restrictive and too costly in the care they provide. There has been a lot of talk about Blue Cross (hospitalization) plans being able

to handle hospital care; but even after more than 15 years of existence these plans cover only seventeen to eighteen million people—most of these in large urban centers. Hospitalization is the easiest kind of insurance in the medical field to sell. Voluntary plans that provide medical care now cover only about 4 percent of the population in spite of recent and very vigorous efforts of the American Medical Association and State medical societies to promote this type of plan. The medical society plans now cover only a few million persons. For the most part they give care only when the patient is in the hospital.

Without exception, voluntary plans are too expensive for the lower-income groups (the people who are most in need of medical care) and there are too many illnesses for which care is not given under these plans.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION BILL

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has already favorably reported out S. 191, the hospital survey and construction bill which will enable hospitals, clinics, and public health centers to be built in communities where they are needed. While the bill has several defects and inadequacies it is an important beginning. By constructing hospitals in rural areas, and other areas where they are needed, it will be possible to speed up the progress of comprehensive hospital care. In turn, the prepayment of medical care costs, including the costs of hospitalization, will assure the maintenance of the hospitals which will be built and will encourage the construction and improvement of needed hospitals. A sound hospital-construction program requires that there is also an insurance system to cover hospitalization costs in order to make sure that hospitals will be used by sick persons and that satisfactory wages, hours, and working conditions of hospital employees will insure high standards of hospital maintenance.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs already has before it legislation providing for the promotion of medical research and professional education. The passage of such legislation should help to advance medical discoveries, to improve the quality of medical research in our universities and medical schools, and to make it possible to give opportunities for further training and education to many more young men and women. At the present time many promising individuals are denied this opportunity because of lack of financial means and because of the restrictions which the medical schools apply particularly to persons of minority groups.

The National Health Act which I have introduced contains provision for medical research and education, particularly in section 314 (f) (1) and 314 (l) of the Public Health Service Act (pt. A of title I of the bill) and section 213 of title II of the bill.

The amended provisions in the Public Health Service Act will make additional Federal funds available to the States through the United States Public Health Service for public health research, training of personnel, public health education, and planning and coordination of health services and activities.

Section 213 of the bill provides that, as a part of the prepaid medical care program, the Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education. Such grants would be made for projects showing promise of making valuable contributions to the education and training of persons in furnishing health benefits or of making valuable contributions with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of disease or disability. Provision is made

for giving preference to educational projects for returning servicemen seeking postgraduate education or training in medical, dental, and related fields. The initial sums available for such grants-in-aid would be \$10,000,000 for 1946 and \$15,000,000 for 1947. The sum available each subsequent year for such grants-in-aid would be 2 percent of the amount expended for health benefits. These grants-in-aid are a necessary part of any prepaid medical-care program. They will enable medical schools to develop more adequate programs for general practitioners, specialists, and other medical personnel to take refresher and postgraduate courses so that such persons can keep abreast of modern medical discoveries. Under present-day arrangements the results of new discoveries are not brought quickly enough to the attention of all practitioners.

The GI bill of rights contains educational provisions and loans which also should help during the next few years to break down the barriers to further professional education and research which have existed. But the GI bill will only apply for a limited period of time to only part of the population. We must have permanent and comprehensive legislation covering all medical research and education and allied fields. Such legislation under a national health program should, of course, provide for coordination with general research and education programs.

CASH BENEFITS DURING DISABILITY

A comprehensive national-health program cannot be achieved without providing cash benefits to individuals during periods of sickness or disability. I have already introduced legislation with Senator MURRAY (S. 1050) and Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives (H. R. 3293) which provides for such payments during both temporary or extended sickness or disability as a part of our other cash social insurance payments. This legislation already is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. These pending bills also provide that there should be set aside annually an amount equal to 2 percent of the social insurance benefits paid on behalf of all such disabled individuals to be used for medical, surgical, institutional, rehabilitation, or other services to disabled individuals entitled to receive cash disability insurance benefits, if such services are not otherwise available through existing legislation, and might aid such individuals to return to gainful work.

I am hopeful that Committees of the Senate and House which have this matter now before them will hold hearings on it soon to expedite this legislation as part of both a national health program and an expanded social security program.

OTHER HEALTH LEGISLATION

There also are pending before the Congress at the present time several other special bills relating to health, each limited to a particular problem. While each problem—and each bill—has certain merit, piecemeal consideration of each separate problem by the Congress is not the most satisfactory way of developing a sound national health program. Such a piecemeal approach inevitably results in gaps, overlaps, and inconsistencies; it may result in competition for trained personnel to administer such programs, especially in cases where a sufficient number of trained persons is not yet available. I hope, therefore, that each such pending bill will be considered in relation to a comprehensive national health program.

The appropriate committees of Congress also should go into all aspects of health which impede providing adequate medical care. The present deplorable situation with respect to institutional care in many communities indicates the need for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the improvement of standards, services, and working and living

conditions in these institutions. State licensure laws are so complex, so lacking in uniformity, and so obstructive of interstate mobility of qualified practitioners that some Federal legislation is necessary to bring order out of this chaos. There are no medical schools in some States, and measures to remedy this defect should be considered. Finally, the discrimination which most medical schools practice against student applicants from minority groups requires congressional consideration and appropriate action.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1945

The National Health Act of 1945 contains three titles, as follows:

Title I—Grants to States for Health Services.

Title II—Personal Health Service Benefits.

Title III—General Provisions.

TITLE I—GRANTS TO STATES FOR HEALTH SERVICES

Title I contains three parts, as follows:

Part A—Grants to States for Public Health Services.

Part B—Grants to States for Maternal and Child Health Services.

Part C—Grants to States for Medical Care of Needy Persons.

All three parts of title I provided grants-in-aid to the States for health services for which the Federal Government already provides funds. In general, the purpose of this title is to amend and broaden existing legislation by eliminating existing restrictions so that present State and local programs can operate more effectively.

PART A—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

This section amends section 314 of the Public Health Service Act. The provisions concerned with grants for the venereal disease and for the tuberculosis programs are unchanged. The subsections dealing with general public-health work are revised so as to strengthen the program and pledge complete Federal cooperation to the States in moving as rapidly as practicable toward the development of adequate public-health services in all parts of the country. The present authorization of \$20,000,000 a year for grants to States is replaced by an authorization to appropriate a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes. Also, the maximum annual amount authorized to be available to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for demonstrations, training of personnel, and administrative expenses is increased from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 a year.

In order to receive the Federal grants the States are required to develop their own plans in accordance with their own needs, and to submit these plans for approval. They must be approved by the Surgeon General if they meet the requirements that are specified in the bill. An orderly system of arrangements is laid down, insuring reasonable standards and systematic financial participation by the States. This is the same general pattern as has been followed for public assistance since the original Social Security Act of 1935. The amounts of the grants to States are determined by an explicit formula, designed to give proportionately more aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 50 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs.

Section 314 (k) of the Public Health Service Act provides for coordination between the administration of the public health services under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

PART B—GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

This section relates to Federal cooperation with the States to provide health services for mothers and children. A common plan is followed in each of the two aspects of this

part, dealing respectively with maternal and child health and with crippled children. In order to receive Federal grants, the States are to develop their own plans, in accordance with their own needs. If these plans meet the requirements specified in the bill, they must be approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. The requirements are those that are essential to insure reasonable standards, systematic financing and administration, and reasonably rapid extension of the services to all parts of the States and on an adequate basis. Administration by the Federal authorities is required to be in close consultation with the State authorities.

As in the case of grants for public-health work and medical care for needy persons, the Federal grants in part B would be on a variable basis, so as to give special aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 50 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs, the amount in each case being determined by a specific formula written into the bill. The Federal Government would be entering into full partnership with the States in providing services for mothers and children, leaving wide latitude to the States as to the scope and content of the programs.

Section 128 (c) of this part provides for coordination between the administration of the provisions under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

PART C—GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF NEEDY PERSONS

This section provides Federal grants to States for medical care to persons determined by the States to be needy under a cooperative Federal-State plan of public assistance. It provides variable Federal grants to the States, ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent of the total expended, depending upon the State's per capita income. The higher rates apply to the States with the lower per capita incomes. The program authorizes Federal matching, on this variable-grant basis, of medical care for any needy individual (without the rigid maxima contained in existing law).

These Federal grants, like the similar provisions of the present law, are to be made out of general revenues. As under existing law, State plans must meet various requirements specified in the bill, including maintenance of civil-service merit standards for administrative personnel.

The limitations in the existing Federal law are removed so that States may obtain Federal funds to help provide medical care to needy persons and thereby to reduce illness and suffering and wherever possible to help needy persons to be restored to self-support. Most States are already providing such care under existing public-welfare laws, but, because of the restrictions in the Federal law, this care is not adequate. By providing Federal financial participation toward meeting part of such costs, States will be encouraged to broaden the scope and improve the quality of such medical care.

In view of the fact that the proposed legislation would make additional Federal funds available to every State in the Union, it is essential that the State programs provide more adequate assistance and improved and simplified administration. Since under this part the largest part of the total cost will come from Federal funds, it is reasonable that all persons in the United States who are actually determined to be needy by State agencies be given medical care. The bill provides that as a condition for obtaining Federal funds the State public-assistance plan must provide for distribution of funds so as to assure meeting in full the medical need of individuals throughout the State as determined in accordance with standards established by the State. This provision would not modify the existing law which places upon the State the responsibility for determining

who is a needy individual and the amount of assistance to be granted such individual. It is designed, however, to assure that needy individuals in a particular county will not be denied assistance because of the lack of adequate local financial participation by such county.

Section 136 of this part provides for coordination between the administration of medical care under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

TITLE II—PREPAID PERSONAL HEALTH SERVICE BENEFITS

Title II of the bill provides for a system of prepaid personal health service benefits.

Section 212 of the bill establishes a personal health services account, out of which all the benefits under this title are to be paid.

The financial barrier to adequate hospital and medical care is the basic reason for the unequal distribution of doctors and hospitals as between urban and rural area and as between prosperous and underprivileged communities. It is the basic reason for the failure of low-income families to receive as much medical care as the well-to-do, although they have more sickness. It is an important cause of the shockingly high rate of rejections under selective service.

A system of prepaid medical care will go a long way toward breaking down this financial barrier. Such a system will enable the people to obtain all needed medical care and will give them security against catastrophic costs for which they cannot budget individually. It will encourage doctors to settle in rural areas and communities to construct needed hospitals and health centers by assuring adequate incomes, equipment, and facilities for modern medical practice. It will benefit patients, doctors, and hospitals.

Title II of the bill provides for a comprehensive system of prepaid medical care. The provisions of the bill are based upon long and careful study of existing prepayment medical care plans in this country and abroad. The provisions of the bill are consistent with the policies and program set forth (1) in the Report of the Health Program Conference on Principles of a Nation-wide Health Program, issued in 1944 by 29 leading health experts, including 13 medical doctors; (2) in the report on medical care in a national health program, adopted in 1944 by the American Public Health Association; (3) in the policies set forth in the recent statement on the people's health, issued by the Physician's Forum; and (4) in statement No. 16, issued October 3, 1945, by the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care. Representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations joined in the adoption of the first-named report. The provisions of the bill are consistent with the policies and programs set down by both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in their annual conventions.

A Nation-wide comprehensive prepayment medical-care plan can be financed in any one of several different ways. Premiums can, for such a purpose, be raised through income or general taxes or through pay roll contributions, or both. In either case minimum and maximum provision can be provided. The extent of a general governmental contribution out of general revenues to such a plan depends upon the comprehensiveness of the groups covered and the services provided. All in all, these problems are best decided after a decision has been reached on all the details of the medical-care plan itself. Moreover, the financial details relating to the raising of the revenue for the plan raises many special problems which have a bearing on existing income taxes and pay roll contributions and should be considered in relation to these laws.

The bill does not, therefore, specify any particular method by which the sums authorized to be appropriated under section 212 of title II would be raised. Since under the Constitution legislation relating to the raising of revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, this matter has been left to separate legislation. There is already pending before the Congress legislation (H. R. 3293 and the companion bill S. 1050) which provides for the raising of revenue for personal health service benefits. This separation of legislation between the revenue and benefit aspects of the program is in keeping with previous practice. In both 1935 and 1937 legislation relating to railroad retirement was considered and enacted in this way.

It is both necessary and desirable that first and foremost consideration should be given to the benefits. If the Congress thinks that it is sound to provide prepaid medical care to the American people, the method of financing such a plan can be worked out jointly by the appropriate committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over these matters.

PREPAID MEDICAL CARE IS NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Propagandists for some organized medical groups have criticized a national prepaid medical-care on the ground that it involves "regimentation of doctors and patients," "lowered standards," "political medicine," and "socialized medicine," and so on. But prepaid medical care is not socialized medicine; it is not state medicine. These "devil words" are all designed to confuse the issue.

A system of prepaid medical care is simply a method of assuring a person ready access to the medical care that he or she needs by eliminating the financial barrier between the patient and doctor or hospital. Since patients are guaranteed free choice of doctors, doctors are guaranteed the right to accept or reject patients, and hospitals are guaranteed freedom to manage their affairs, it should be obvious that the system does not involve regimentation of doctors, hospitals, or patients. Neither do I believe the propaganda that the doctors of this country will lower the standards of medical care simply because they are guaranteed payment for their services.

There are many individuals, honest and sincere in their desire for improved conditions, who nevertheless fear any change, and distrust all new social legislation. Those of us who have sponsored social legislation have faced similar opposition against many proposals for social betterment, but we have persevered and succeeded, and we have seen these new programs accepted as part of our basic system of American freedom and democracy. Over 30 years ago in the New York Legislature I fought for workmen's accident compensation and most of the arguments which are being made against prepaid medical care now were made against workmen's compensation then. Now all of the States but one have workmen's compensation laws—all include medical benefits, which is health insurance for industrial accidents and disease. The time has come for us to extend the principle of health insurance to cover nonindustrial accidents and diseases as well.

The fears and doubts expressed about workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and other measures for social security have proved to be without foundation. In the future, when we have succeeded in our struggle for a comprehensive health program for the entire country, we will be able to say about health insurance, too, that present-day apprehensions and misgivings were groundless.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE SAFEGUARDED

Freedom of medical practice is carefully safeguarded. Each person is entitled to

choose his own family doctor from among all physicians or groups of physicians in the community who have voluntarily agreed to go into the system. Each doctor or group of doctors is free to go in or stay out of the system. These doctors who participate are free to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them as their family doctor, and the participating doctors are specifically given the right to choose the method through which they are to be paid for the services they furnish. Patients and doctors may change the arrangements after they have been made if they become dissatisfied. Doctors practicing as specialists, individually or in groups, would be entitled to special rates of payment if they meet professional standards for specialists. Existing arrangements for hospital care would not be disturbed.

Every effort also has been made to protect the professional position of dentists, nurses, and nursing organizations. Hospitals are guaranteed protection against interference in the management of their own affairs. The basic policy has been to provide medical and related services through arrangements that are worked out so that they will be satisfactory to the public and to those who furnish the services. Mutual agreements, reached through negotiations and contracts, are specified in the bill as the method to be used, and that is the democratic way of doing things.

The Surgeon General is authorized to negotiate cooperative working arrangements with Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and with private groups or individuals, to provide the benefits by utilizing their services and facilities on payment of fair and reasonable compensation. The health benefits may be furnished to noncovered persons such as needy persons receiving public assistance, if appropriate arrangements are made to pay on their behalf the cost of services furnished to them.

VOLUNTARY PLANS AIDED

There has been much misunderstanding about the part that voluntary hospitals, group-service organizations, existing voluntary insurance or prepayment plans and similar agencies may play in a prepaid medical-care system. Let me emphasize that our bill makes a place for them, so that they can continue their good work. All qualified hospitals, all qualified medical groups or organizations, will be able to participate in the program as organizations that will furnish services to the insured persons who choose them; they will receive fair payments for the services they furnish under the bill; and they will have enlarged opportunities to be service agencies for particular groups or for their communities. This applies to service organizations created by trade unions, consumer groups, employers, nonprofit community groups, churches, fraternal associations, groups of doctors or individual doctors, medical societies, or many other kinds of sponsors, or groups of sponsors. The bill not only provides for utilizing existing service organizations but it also encourages the creation of new ones.

The groups operating under the Blue Cross hospital-insurance plans will be able to continue to act as representative of the participating hospitals and the community groups that own or manage the hospitals, and they will have large opportunities to be important public organizations that facilitate the administration of vital parts of the insurance system. The same will be true for many other community and public organizations.

Medical service groups—private clinics, salaried staffs of hospitals, group-service plans such as the Kaiser or the Ross-Loos plan—furnishing service under the system would be as free as they are today to select their own staffs and their own method of paying physicians and others on their staffs, irrespective of the method of payment which

prevailed among the individually practicing physicians or dentists of the local area.

HOSPITAL CARE

Hospital care is limited to 60 days per year, with a possible maximum of 120 days if experience proves that such benefits can be afforded. All qualified hospitals are eligible to participate. The Surgeon General is forbidden from exercising supervision or control over the management of hospitals that participate in the system.

DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION

Every effort has been made to keep a fair balance in the bill between the principles of administrative responsibility and democratic administration. The administrative officers are given duties to perform and the necessary authority so that they can carry out their duties efficiently and promptly. But their authority is carefully limited through checks and balances. Limitations are carefully specified in the bill; for example, the rights of insured persons and of physicians and hospitals are set down.

Moreover, the Surgeon General is directed to decentralize the administration of the program to the maximum extent possible, and administration through the States and localities is given preference and priority wherever the State and local authorities wish to take over the responsibility. Where no such arrangements have been made, the Surgeon General is directed to establish committees in each locality to aid in the administration of the program and to assure that the program will be adapted to local needs. Such committees shall include representatives of the insured population, doctors, hospitals, other agencies furnishing service under the program, and other persons informed on the need for, or provision of, health benefits. These provisions assure that there will not be any dictatorship or regimentation under the bill, as some propagandists have implied.

The Surgeon General is directed to establish a National Advisory Policy Council with which he is required to consult on all important questions of policy and administration. Members of this Advisory Council would be appointed from panels of names submitted by professional and other organizations concerned with medical services, education, hospitals, etc. The Advisory Council must also include representatives of the public. The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to the Congress each year on the administration of the program. Such report must include a record of the consultations with the Advisory Council, recommendations of the council, and any comments thereon. Such a report assures that all relevant facts, opinions, recommendations, and actions of the Surgeon General and the Advisory Council will be public information and that the Congress has full information upon which to revise or amend the law. To assure that the Advisory Council will and can meet on its own motion the bill provides that the council shall meet not less frequently than twice a year and whenever at least four members request a meeting. The bill also provides that the council itself and each of its members shall be provided by the Surgeon General with secretarial, clerical, or other assistants. Finally, the council itself may establish special advisory, technical, regional, or local committees or commissions, whose membership may include members of the Advisory Council or other persons or both, to advise upon general or special questions, professional and technical subjects, questions concerning administration, problems affecting regions or localities, and related matters.

The bill specifically provides that all such councils—national and local—are to be only advisory to the appropriate administrative officers. Some medical groups have strongly advocated that the advice of such councils

should be binding upon the administrator; that the national council should have power to veto the action of the administrator; and that the council should approve all regulations before they are issued. Such provisions have not been included in the bill because they are contrary to sound principles of public administration. Such a provision would result in the delegation of public authority to private persons. It would bestow upon private interests the control of the entire program. Only in recent years has it become apparent that adequate medical care is as much a concern to the consumer of medical care—the public—as to the producers and distributors of medical care. The technical and professional aspects of medical or hospital care should be under the constant control and supervision of qualified professional personnel. But sound public policy demands that on other aspects of medical care—such as financial matters and the administration of medical care—the public must have a voice and the controlling interest.

Throughout the bill, there are specific provisions requiring the Surgeon General to consult with the National Advisory Council on particular matters. Thus, section 205 (c) requires that in determining what are specialist or consultant services (for the purpose of higher rates of remuneration to persons rendering such services), the Surgeon General must establish general standards only after consultation with the advisory council. Similarly, in connection with, including any hospital on the list of participating hospitals, section 206 (b) requires that the Surgeon General make his finding of facts and decisions on the status of any hospital in accordance with general standards established only after consultation with the advisory council. In placing any limitations on benefits under section 210 the Surgeon General must also first consult the advisory council.

Moreover, section 204 (b) of the bill specifically states that the Advisory Council shall advise the Surgeon General on—but it is not limited to—the following seven matters:

1. Professional standards of quality to apply to personal health service benefits;
2. Designation of specialists and consultants;
3. Methods and arrangements to stimulate and encourage the attainment of high standards through coordination of the services of general or family practitioners, specialists and consultants, laboratories, and other auxiliary services, and through the coordination of the services of physicians and dentists with those of educational and research institutions, hospitals and public-health centers, and through other useful means;
4. Standards to apply to participating hospitals, to the relations or coordination among hospitals, and to the establishment and maintenance of the list of participating hospitals;
5. Adequate and suitable methods and arrangements of paying for personal health service benefits;
6. Studies and surveys of personal health services and of the quality and adequacy of such services; and
7. Grants-in-aid for professional education and research projects.

The bill places responsibility for the sound administration of the prepaid medical-care program in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The office of the Surgeon General is and has been nonpolitical and has developed close and satisfactory relations with State and local health officers and with officials and members of the American Medical Association. By placing responsibility in the hands of a single administrator long versed in medical administration, prompt, efficient, and economical administration of the prepaid medical-care system can be assured.

Some organized medical groups have criticized this provision on the grounds that it centralizes too much authority in one man and that it tends toward medical dictatorship. As I have indicated, I do not think there is any merit to this charge. But if the Congress should come to the conclusion that there is any merit to this criticism, it could place the responsibility for the over-all administration of the program in the hands of a board of say three or five persons, with the possibility of utilizing the Surgeon General as the administrative officer of such a board. If such an arrangement is adopted it should be clear, however, that all or the majority of the members of the board should be full-time public members with no financial or other interest which would be inconsistent with their responsibility for nonpartisan, competent administration in the public interest. Any other arrangements would be contrary to the best interests of the consumers of medical care.

Specific provision is included in the bill for hearings and appeals on any disputed issues between practitioners, hospitals, and covered persons. Specific provision is made for the judicial review of any disputed issues arising under the plan. Here again, the bill establishes adequate protection against any regimentation or dictatorship.

HIGH MEDICAL STANDARDS ENCOURAGED

High standards of medical care are protected and encouraged through incentives for the professional advancement of doctors, postgraduate study, professional education, research, and the availability—regardless of the patient's ability to pay—of consultant and specialist services (including the services of surgeons, internists, psychiatrists, obstetricians, pediatricians, dermatologists, and others, hospital and similar facilities, laboratory services, optometry services, and X-ray services. Provision is made for the addition of dental and home-nursing services as rapidly as practical. The bill is clear in requiring that the arrangements to provide the medical and related services shall be worked out so that they are mutually agreeable to the administrative officers and to those who agree to furnish the services.

The bill contains various provisions to assure that medical benefits will be of the highest quality that can be made available, will promote personal relations between doctor and patient, will emphasize prevention of disease, and will be adapted to the needs and practices of the community, in both rural and urban areas.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service—a doctor—would administer the technical and professional aspects of the program. The Surgeon General would also be directed to work out the closest possible coordination between the prepaid medical and hospital services and the public health services of the Federal, State, and local governments.

The Surgeon General and the Social Security Board are directed to make studies and to report to Congress on dental, nursing, or other services not provided under the system, and on services and facilities needed for the care of the chronic sick and for persons afflicted with mental diseases.

The Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 301 provides for the usual separability clause.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have been very much interested in the statement of the Sena-

tor from New York about the bill which he on behalf of himself and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has just introduced. Does the Senator's bill take care of all the people, particularly I have in mind the large group engaged in agriculture and those living in the rural districts?

Mr. WAGNER. It does.

Mr. HILL. In other words, it is all-inclusive?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; it is all-inclusive.

Mr. HILL. The provision for the prepayment of medical costs under the insurance plan would take in everybody.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Austin | Gurney | Murdock |
| Bali | Hart | Myers |
| Barkley | Hatch | O'Daniel |
| Blair | Hawkes | O'Mahoney |
| Brewster | Hayden | Radcliffe |
| Bridges | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Buck | Hill | Revercomb |
| Bushfield | Hoey | Robertson |
| Butler | Huffman | Russell |
| Byrd | Johnson, Colo. | Shipstead |
| Capper | Johnston, S. C. | Smith |
| Carville | Knowland | Stewart |
| Chavez | La Follette | Taft |
| Connally | Lucas | Taylor |
| Cordon | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Donnell | McClellan | Tunnell |
| Downey | McFarland | Tydings |
| Eastland | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Ellender | McMahon | Wagner |
| Ferguson | Maybank | Walsh |
| Fulbright | Mead | Wheeler |
| George | Millikin | White |
| Gerry | Mitchell | Wiley |
| Green | Moore | Wilson |
| Guffey | Morse | Young |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEATS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to detain the Senate for but a few moments.

On the 8th of November I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 185), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The resolution concludes with the following:

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meats as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

Mr. President, the date of November 15, of course, has already passed. The

resolution, which was submitted by me, is one of the "whereas" resolutions. It includes a sort of summary of the evidence submitted and the conclusions reached by a subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee at various and sundry hearings on the meats, fats, and oil situation. I shall read the resolution. I might state at the outset that my purpose in referring to the resolution at this time is to explain the reasons for not having called it up for consideration before November 15, and further to ask that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the resolution does not ask anything of the Office of Price Administration. It asks that the Department of Agriculture be directed to require OPA to cease the rationing.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is not asking for consideration of the resolution at this time?

Mr. STEWART. No; I would not do that, of course. All I shall ask at this time is that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I may say further at the outset that I have already mentioned this matter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who appears not to be in the Chamber at the moment though he was here a few minutes ago, and he advises me he has no objection to such a request.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States military services and other Government agencies have recently released for public consumption in the United States 100,000,000 pounds of high quality creamery butter; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to sell 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter in foreign markets; and

Whereas 100,000,000 pounds of creamery butter added to current commercial stocks and expected production during November and December 1945 will provide at least 150,000,000 pounds of creamery butter for each such month; and

Whereas 150,000,000 pounds a month is more than enough to provide for all unrestricted domestic civilian consumption of high quality creamery butter during November and December and provide for an adequate year end carry-over; and

Whereas the production of butter begins to increase in December, due to seasonal factors, and continues to increase monthly for the ensuing 6 months; and

Whereas civilians will have the entire United States butter production available for their use during 1946, with the exception of very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas oleomargarine, which is used for the same purpose, is in surplus supply; and

Whereas there will continue to be sufficient fats and oils available to produce supplies of oleomargarine equal to the demand for it; and

Whereas the current civilian allocation of other fats and oils, including lard, is at the highest rate since the initiation of fats and oils rationing; and

Whereas shortening, salad and cooking oils are being produced in quantities greater than at any time since regulations were imposed and in quantities greater than those produced prior to the war; and

Whereas the supply of raw materials needed to produce shortening, salad and cooking oils will continue to be sufficient to maintain this production; and

Whereas the production of lard, one of the chief fats and oils, will be substantially increased beginning not later than November 1, due to the seasonal increase in hog slaughter; and

Whereas the availability of supply is now sufficient to provide as much fats and oils as has ever before been consumed in this country during a peacetime period; and

Whereas the total domestic production of fats and oils, including lard, during 1946 will be available for civilian consumption, except for very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas meat supplies in the United States at the present time are admittedly available at the annual rate of 159 pounds per capita and will continue to be available at this rate for the remainder of the year; and

Whereas meat supplies in this quantity are greater than were ever before available in the United States during any prewar period; and

Whereas meat supplies will be available during 1946 at a rate far in excess of the quantity consumed at any previous time; and

Whereas the supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese are abundant; and

Whereas the military has ceased purchasing poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese; and

Whereas the large supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese will supplement the supplies of meat available for civilian consumption in the United States; and

Whereas the continuation of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat is causing hoarding, maldistribution, and disruption of normal marketing; and

Whereas the expense of continuing rationing is no longer warranted; and

Whereas industry is capable of reestablishing normal distribution of these commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by changing the date from November 15 to December 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is now submitting a new resolution?

Mr. STEWART. No, Mr. President. This is a resolution which I submitted on the 8th of this month, in which I asked for the discontinuance of rationing of the products referred to in it at a date not later than November 15, 1945. That date has now passed. That is the reason I ask to amend the resolution. It is the same resolution which I submitted on the 8th of November. As I stated, it is one of the "whereas" resolutions. The whereases constitute a summary of the evidence and conclusions reached by the Small Business Subcommittee, of which I was chairman, as a result of numerous

hearings we have held this fall on the subject.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Because the OPA was involved.

Mr. STEWART. I assume that was the reason.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now understand the Senator is asking unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STEWART. I am going to propound such a request, that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the resolution asks that the Department of Agriculture be required to direct the OPA to discontinue rationing. I understand that the OPA has no further control over rationing, except under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. So I believe that the resolution was improperly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think the Senator from Utah was in the Chamber when I stated that I had discussed this question with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and that he agreed with me that the resolution had been improperly referred. At least, he said he would have no objection to the request which I intend to propound in a moment. Before propounding the request I wish to say a word or two about the resolution.

From time to time for the past 3 or 4 months we have been holding hearings upon complaints of small packers, individuals, and others interested in industries which might be affected by any decision relating to meats, fats, oils, and so forth. A great many questions, and many phases of the problem were considered. The Senate Small Business Committee, the group which has listened to the hearings, as well as the staff of the committee, has become definitely convinced that the time for the lifting of rationing is here. We feel that there is absolutely a surplus of meat, as well as a surplus of practically all kinds of fats and oils. The only question which may arise at the moment in that connection is as to whether there is an adequate supply of lard and certain pork products. We are told, and the evidence before the committee in the last hearing, approximately 2 weeks ago, was conclusive in the opinion of the experts, that after the first of the year, or between the 1st of December and the first of the year, there will not be a shortage of pork products of any kind, because of the expected increase in the supply of hogs. The accuracy of that view is daily being demonstrated, so we are advised, since the hearing was held. Therefore I think it is but fair to the American public that the rationing of all meat products, as well as fats and oils of all kinds, including butter and oleomargarine, be completely lifted.

On one occasion we were told at the hearings that it was possible that an order to that effect would be made, lifting the rationing by the 1st of November. That was early in the fall. Now we understand that it is to be postponed until the first of the year. That is information which has come more or less indirectly from the Department of Agriculture. But certainly we have an adequate supply of every single item which is needed in the case of practically every one of the fats, oils, and meats referred to in the resolution. Very definitely we have a decided oversupply of butter, and of meat of practically every kind.

All these commodities are purchased with red rationing points. The same kind of points used to purchase a beef roast are used to purchase a pound of butter. I understand they are called red points. So all these products are in the same category. An oversupply of one balances a short supply of the other to a certain extent. We have now reached the point where we have an oversupply of practically all of them.

We learned at the hearings that the southern part of the country consumes a much larger amount per capita of fats, butter, lard, and oils than does any other section of the country. The average per capita consumption is between 48 and 50 pounds throughout the entire Nation, but in the southern part of the country, where many coal mines are located and where cotton and other crops are industriously cultivated in the hot season of the year, the people consume an average of approximately 100 pounds a person, which is about twice the national average. Naturally, therefore, this summer and fall there was a great shortage of fats and oils in the southern area of the United States, and we had considerable difficulty in having adjustments made; but fortunately after 3 or 4 weeks we were able to have sent into that section at least a temporarily adequate supply of fats and oils.

It is our belief that if rationing on fats and oils and meats can be lifted, the problem will naturally adjust itself within a reasonably short time. With a large oversupply of every one of the products mentioned in the resolution, I think it is but right and proper that the order which the resolution proposes should be issued.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has not yet returned to the Chamber. I think perhaps he is at lunch. However, he stated to me that he would have no objection to my request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 185, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A CONSTRUCTIVE WOOL POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning the Special Committee of

the Senate on the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool began hearings which it is hoped may result in the development of a constructive wool policy by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. At those hearings I made an opening statement to which I should like to invite the attention of Members of Congress, as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask that this statement, entitled "Wanted, a Constructive Wool Policy for the United States," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States is without a wool policy. Although it is the world's best market for wool, it produces less than it consumes. Its domestic producers of wool are unable to enter the market with the slightest confidence because exporting countries which consume far less than they produce pursue a very positive policy intended to capture the American market.

The three principal exporters of wool are the British Dominions, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Of these South Africa in the period before the war consumed practically none of its wool, New Zealand less than 3 percent, and Australia scarcely 7 percent. Among them they will have, in the postwar period, an estimated exportable surplus of 1,440,000,000 pounds, which, when added to the accumulated stocks now on hand, will mean a total surplus of almost 4,500,000,000 pounds in world trade.

During the war the consumption of wool in the United States has been doubled because we have produced here unexpectedly large amounts of both military and civilian wools. Imports which in 1942 amounted to 60 percent of the total amount of wool consumed by the United States mills had risen in August of this year to 88 percent. Meanwhile, there has been accumulated in the United States a stock pile of British owned wool amounting now to 286,000,000 pounds which, when added to the United Kingdom and Dominion stocks, makes a total of 3,601,000,000 pounds.

Unless a positive program is developed to stimulate the utilization of wool the prospects for consuming this tremendous surplus are not bright with consequent disadvantageous effects on the domestic producers.

The industrial plants of Germany have been practically destroyed and while it is reported that textile mills in France and Belgium have not been seriously damaged, there is little likelihood that these countries can be expected rapidly to resume even their prewar consumption. Thus the burden of wool consumption is thrown on the United States. Here, however, with the demand for military uniforms at an end, the market for wool will be measured largely by civilian consumption.

The loyalty of the British Dominions to the mother country is easily understood when one considers the leadership which the Government of the United Kingdom is providing the Dominions in planning for the disposal of their huge surpluses. Representatives of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa met in London early this year to confer with representatives of the United Kingdom to devise a plan by which British stocks and the future clips may be sold in such manner as to protect the producer from loss. The British Government has constituted itself a highly able and successful salesman for the wool producers of its Dominions. It is the hope of American wool producers that their Government will not be less jealous of their interests than the United Kingdom is of the interests of the

producers of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

It is true that during the war the Commodity Credit Corporation has from year to year purchased the domestic clip in this country at ceiling prices. This policy has been beneficial, but it has existed only on a year-to-year basis and to date there is no indication of what the future program is likely to be.

It is true also that when, at the beginning of the war, this Government undertook to permit the United Kingdom to establish a stock pile of wool in the United States it effected an agreement that the wool should not be sold in the United States until the United States and Great Britain had agreed upon the conditions of sale, one of which would be the payment of the tariff duty. This agreement has been respected, but it is one of the major objectives of British policy to dispose of the United Kingdom stock pile in this country as soon as it can be done.

Two other aspects of Government policy toward United States production are not quite so satisfactory. Ceiling prices on wool have been held down in the face of increased costs of production while, in the public-lands States, grazing authorities of both the Department of Agriculture, through the United States Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior, through the Grazing Service, have indicated a positive desire to increase the fees paid by producers for grazing upon the forest reserves and the grazing districts. The net result of this uncertain, not to say contradictory Government policy, has been an accelerating liquidation of domestic flocks. It is now estimated that the 1946 clip in the United States will not be more than 300,000,000 pounds as against a normal prewar clip of approximately 450,000,000 pounds. The numbers of breeding sheep in the United States have declined approximately 25 percent since 1942.

It is thus evident that the time has come for Congress and the executive arm of this Government to develop a constructive policy with respect to wool. We cannot be less considerate of the American producers than our British cousins are of the Dominion producers. It would seem that this is the appropriate time for the Government of the United States to announce such a policy, for the terms and conditions of an American loan to Great Britain of large proportions are now under active consideration by the representatives of the two governments.

This special Senate committee, recognizing the importance of the problem, has invited not only the representatives of Government agencies which have jurisdiction over matters affecting the wool industry, but the representatives of all branches of the domestic wool industry to assemble here to give consideration to the development of a constructive United States policy. One thing seems to be clear, namely, that in the face of a world surplus of wool our greatest need is to seek ways and means of expanding the market. It is by finding broader uses of wool, that is to say, by increased consumption, that we can best attack the disposal of the huge surplus. The British conferees who worked out the British wool program have estimated that it will take 13 years from June 30, 1945, to eliminate the present stock.

Wherever we turn we are confronted with surpluses, whether it be with respect to war facility plants built by this Government to supply the United Nations with the materials of war or agricultural commodities like wool. Heretofore we have attacked this problem by the restriction of production if not by the actual destruction of the commodities themselves and this has been done in the face of the acknowledged fact that by far the great majority of the people of the world are still unable to purchase the commodities which they need to maintain a decent standard of living. The State Department in its negotiations with foreign

countries may well consider ways and means of urging foreign governments to stimulate living standards abroad so that the United States will not be called upon to continue to absorb world surpluses to the disadvantage of American producers.

The question, however, is presented not only to Government, but also to industry, what can be done to increase the consumption? What can be done to make it possible for people here and everywhere to secure and use more of the commodities which we are so clearly capable of producing?

What can the manufacturers of woollens do to promote the use of wool and particularly what can American manufacturers do to help the American producer stabilize his market at a level that will enable him to meet the cost of production? What can the wool trade do to promote this objective? By the suggestions which are offered here before this Senate committee and the assembled representatives of Government it surely will be possible to develop an American wool policy.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the distinction between the committee amendment and the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I offered last Friday.

The committee amendment was prepared on the theory that very limited power should be given to the President, within certain well-defined channels and with a number of exceptions, to present a reorganization plan to the Congress for its action. The committee amendment also provided that after a period of 60 days, if the plan were not vetoed, by concurrent resolution of both Houses, it would become law. Objection was made to the committee amendment from two different standpoints, and it was because of those objections that I offered my amendment as a substitute, in order to meet all the objections which have been made to the committee amendment.

My substitute simply provides that the President shall submit a reorganization plan, and it limits him in no way as to the field he shall cover or the executive departments he shall include, and on the other hand, in order to make the procedure constitutional and to preserve our congressional legislative power, it provides that such a plan, in order to go into effect and to become law, must have the affirmative approval of Congress by means of a joint resolution passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

That, briefly stated, is the alternate plan which, if adopted, will save us all the confusion which now has been brought about by the committee proposal with all the exceptions and amendments which have been offered and all the en-

deavors which have been made to curtail the President's initiative, and to surround him with all sorts of limitations and difficulties in proposing his program. At the same time, my substitute also obviates the constitutional objection, namely, that legislation cannot be enacted without the affirmative action of both Houses of Congress. It seems to me that if the Members of the Senate will recognize the simplicity of the substitute proposal and adopt it, it will be possible to move immediately in the direction of a worth-while reorganization plan, and bring about expeditious action upon it.

It has been suggested to me today, Mr. President, that there are two objections to my plan. One is that my proposal specifies no date before which the President shall submit his plan. If an amendment providing for a deadline when the President shall submit his plan is offered, I shall be very glad to have it included in my amendment. The other suggestion is that my substitute fails to provide a way by which the reorganization plan, after it has been submitted to the Congress by the President and has been referred to a committee, shall automatically get out of the committee, in the event it becomes buried there. I shall be very glad to have that point taken care of by providing that after a certain number of days a plan which has been referred to a committee shall automatically be returned to the Senate.

In brief, Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute provides, first, that the Congress shall approve a reorganization plan submitted by the President by regular constitutional process, involving positive legislative action taken by both Houses of Congress; and, above all, my plan will give the President a free hand to tell the Congress exactly how he believes the executive branch of Government should be reorganized. That is the difference between the committee plan and the plan I have proposed.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator from New Jersey contend that the President does not now have the right to submit to Congress such a reorganization plan, without having the Congress take any action at this time?

Mr. SMITH. That point was raised Friday. Of course, the President does have the right to submit a reorganization plan at this time, but we all realize that over a period of years no President has done so.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator's proposal would give the President additional authority in that respect; would it?

Mr. SMITH. My substitute would call upon the President from time to time to determine whether reorganization in the executive branch of Government is necessary and, if it is found to be necessary, to submit a reorganization plan to the Congress.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; and it would leave the country where it now is; would it not?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not think it would leave the country where it now is,

because it calls upon the President to submit a plan to the Congress, and in title II provides special machinery whereby the House of Representatives and the Senate can expedite action on the plan, whereas under the usual procedure there would be all the ordinary delays incident to the enactment of legislation.

I am convinced that my substitute proposal will result in securing reorganization under a plan submitted by the President. Without the adoption of my proposal, I think no such reorganization would be secured.

Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Austin | Gurney | Morse |
| Ball | Hart | Murdoch |
| Barkley | Hatch | Myers |
| Bilbo | Hayden | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Hickenlooper | Radcliffe |
| Buck | Hill | Reed |
| Butler | Hoey | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Huffman | Robertson |
| Capper | Johnson, Colo. | Russell |
| Carville | Johnston, S. C. | Shipstead |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith |
| Connally | La Follette | Taft |
| Cordon | Lucas | Taylor |
| Donnell | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Downey | McClellan | Tunnell |
| Eastland | McFarland | Tydings |
| Ellender | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Fulbright | McMahon | Walsh |
| George | Maybank | White |
| Gerry | Mead | Wiley |
| Green | Mitchell | Wilson |
| Guffey | Moore | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am compelled to attend a hearing at 2 o'clock, and may not be able to vote on the pending amendment, I wish to express briefly my views with reference to it.

I am opposed to any amendment which requires affirmative action on the part of Congress, by joint resolution or otherwise, before any reorganization ordered by the President may take effect. I would vote for an amendment which would eliminate all exemptions from the pending bill and leave the matter entirely to the President. I would do that no matter who the President might be, because I think we can trust any man who has been elected President of the United States, or who becomes President under our constitutional processes, to have the interest of the country at heart. I think that we can also trust him to have more inside information with reference to the workings of the various departments than we can have as Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only a minute in which to complete what I wish to say, if the Senator will permit me to conclude my statement.

Mr. President, what I have said was without any reflection upon the Congress, because in the very nature of things the President must be more intimately associated with the departments over which he presides as Chief Executive than are we, the Members of Congress.

I feel that if the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] were agreed to it would take us right back to the original proposition that Congress should reorganize the Government. I do not believe that Congress either will or can reorganize the Government. If it had the time to devote a whole session to the subject, without being burdened by any other considerations, it might be able to perform the task. But with all the multitude of duties which burden us and which are on our doorsteps all the time, it is impossible for Congress to reorganize the departments of Government.

I was a member of a special committee on reorganization which was appointed in 1939, of which the former Senator from South Carolina, now the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, was the chairman. As a result of our hearings and our deliberations in connection with the reorganization of the Government, temporary and partial reorganization legislation was enacted. I am convinced that the only way to reorganize effectively the Government is to authorize the President, who is the head of all the departments of the Government, to do so. If he does so in a way which Congress does not approve, then Congress, by joint resolution, should have the right to disapprove. I understand that to be the proposal contained in the pending bill if the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is not adopted. Therefore, while I would vote for an amendment offered by any Senator to eliminate all exemptions—even those contained in the House bill—from the proposed legislation, inasmuch as the pending amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is coupled with the provision that any plan for reorganization which the President may submit must be affirmatively approved by a joint resolution of the two Houses before it can become effective, I am compelled to register my opposition to it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to point out to the Senator that according to the bill which he is supporting, which provides that the President may submit a plan the rejection of which would require a resolution of both Houses, the President and one House alone could put a plan into effect even if every Member of the Senate objected to it. I feel that that is unconstitutional, entirely aside from the unwise policy involved. I agree fully with the Senator that the President is the one who should propose a reorganization plan, and that is why I have eliminated, through my amendment, every restriction which might be placed upon him. He would be free to tell us what kind of a plan he wants, but I insist that after the plan has been presented it should be

within our constitutional power to say whether we will make it law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator's attitude. I do not impugn his good faith in any way. I am sure the Senator is sincere.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not troubled about any suggested inhibitions because I think Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to authorize the President, or any agency which it may designate, to work out a reorganization of the Government departments. Congress created all of those departments in a rather haphazard way. It established them one at a time, and frequently without regard to coordination. Because of that fact we now have the topsy-turvy system about which we all complain constantly and about which we apparently are not willing to authorize anyone to do anything unless we reserve to ourselves the right to undo it by affirmative legislation. I do not believe in that method.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I shall have to leave the Chamber very shortly.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator willing to accept the bill in the form in which it was reported by the committee, providing that if either House objects within the prescribed period—

Mr. BARKLEY. No; personally I would not accept it because I do not think we can legislate by a single House of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. But we are legislating by a single House when we allow one House and the President to put into effect a plan.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; we are not legislating in that way. We are providing that once the President prepares a reorganization plan and submits it to Congress, unless Congress by appropriate legislation—and that means the action of both Houses—shall disapprove it, the plan shall go into effect.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to disagree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the logical constitutional method by which the Congress can declare its attitude with respect to the matter.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I am now compelled to leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a substitute for the committee amendment as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. SALTONSTALL's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] because of a temporary and slight illness. I am authorized to say that if present he would vote "yea" on the pending amendment.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would

vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and vote "yea."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who was in the Chamber a while ago, and I assumed he was still here. I see he is not now present. I therefore transfer the pair which I have with him to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho. The Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—25

| | | |
|---------|--------------|------------|
| Austin | Hickenlooper | Smith |
| Ball | Knowland | Taft |
| Bridges | La Follette | Tydings |
| Butler | Moore | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Morse | White |
| Cordon | Reed | Wiley |
| Donnell | Revercomb | Wilson |
| Gurney | Robertson | |
| Hart | Shipstead | |

NAYS—40

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Barkley | Guffey | Maybank |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Mead |
| Buck | Hayden | Mitchell |
| Byrd | Hill | Murdock |
| Carville | Hoey | Myers |
| Chavez | Huffman | O'Mahoney |
| Connally | Johnson, Colo. | Radcliffe |
| Downey | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Eastland | Lucas | Taylor |
| Ellender | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Fulbright | McClellan | Tunnell |
| George | McFarland | Walsh |
| Gerry | McKellar | |
| Green | McMahon | |

NOT VOTING—29

| | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------|
| Aiken | Glass | Saltonstall |
| Andrews | Hawkes | Stewart |
| Bailey | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Bankhead | Langer | Tobey |
| Brewster | Magnuson | Wagner |
| Briggs | Millikin | Wheeler |
| Brooks | Murray | Wherry |
| Bushfield | O'Daniel | Willis |
| Capehart | Overton | Young |
| Ferguson | Pepper | |

So Mr. SMITH's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out "is hereby repealed", and insert "is hereby amended by striking out the words 'upon the termination of this title' and inserting the words 'on July 1, 1947.'"

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who is unable to be present.

On the 18th page of the bill appears this cryptic sentence:

SEC. 8. The second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), being the last sentence of the said title I, is hereby repealed.

Turning to the First War Powers Act, we find that we gave the President power to reorganize departments, with some limitations, without any reference to Congress whatsoever. The President

has exercised that power throughout the war. Under the First War Powers Act it is provided that at the expiration of war all the departments in which changes have been made shall go back to the condition in which they were before the war.

The effect of the proposed section 8 is to provide that the changes made shall continue forever, although never submitted to the Congress. The effect of my amendment is to provide that they shall continue until July 1, 1947, the last date upon which the President may act under the proposed law. In other words, he will have full opportunity to submit a reorganization plan making the changes permanent if he wishes to do so, and then Congress will have a chance to veto the plan if it desires to do so.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is a reasonable way in which to handle the matter. Many of the changes in the Government set-up were made solely for war purposes. We granted the President the power only with the idea that they should be made for war purposes. It seems to me that now it is proper for us to say that the President may make the changes permanent, under the proposed reorganization law, if he wishes to do so, but if he does not do so by the 1st of July 1947, when his powers under the proposed law will expire, the departments shall revert to their prewar status.

I hope the Senator in charge of the bill may feel that this is a reasonable method of handling the situation. It seems to me we did not intend to make the war changes permanent changes in the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is strictly in line with the philosophy of the bill. I agree that the changes in organization of the executive departments which have been made under the First War Powers Act would become permanent, under the language of the bill, without ever being referred back to the Congress. Under the amendment now offered by the Senator from Ohio proposed changes would be referred back to the Congress, and the time would be identical with the time provided in the pending bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to ask the Senator from Utah if it is not correct to say that there was no intention in the committee to take affirmative action to make these war agencies permanent. There was the intention to bring them within the general reorganization plan. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. HATCH. And there is then no conflict between the intention of the committee and the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can find no objection at all to the amendment and, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and for myself I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, beginning on page 19, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all down to the end of the bill and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. The committee shall have 10 days in which to consider and report out the resolution. If the resolution is not reported out by the committee within such 10 days, the committee shall be deemed to have been discharged from the further consideration of the resolution. On the eleventh day after the referral to the committee of the resolution, it shall become the special order with precedence over any unfinished business. Not later than 1 hour after the House in which such resolution is pending meets on the first day on which it meets following the nineteenth day (Sundays excepted) after the day on which the resolution was introduced, a vote shall be taken in that House on the question of the adoption of the resolution. The resolution shall be debatable up to the time specified above for the taking of the vote, and the time shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No notice or motion to reconsider any vote upon the resolution shall be in order. The procedure provided by this section shall not be applicable with respect to a second resolution relating to the same reorganization plan. In any case in which two or more resolutions with respect to the same reorganization plan are introduced in the same House on the same day, only one resolution with respect to such reorganization plan shall be deemed to have been introduced in that House on that day and such one resolution shall be considered to have been introduced jointly by the sponsors of the separate resolutions relating to such reorganization plan.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, just a word respecting this substitute in title II covering procedure. Briefly stated, if the veto resolution is sent to a committee, the amendment simply makes it automatic that the resolution shall come back to the Senate floor, so that it cannot be buried in committee. The danger in this type of legislation is that a resolution may be buried in committee, and the President's reorganization plan may become law without action by either House. The resolution at least should come back to the floor without having to be voted out of committee. The amendment simply deals with a question of procedure, which the Senator from Michigan and I thought should be embodied in negative legislation of this type. If the President presents a plan, then within 60 days after the plan is presented it goes into effect should there be no action by either House. The danger is that the plan might be buried in committee with no chance for either House to vote. The amendment deals with the question of

procedure. It would simply bring the resolution back on the floor automatically. That is what we are proposing by the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, while the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] contains automatic features, and may in some respects be preferable to the procedure provided for in the bill, it is my opinion that the amendment has not been thoroughly thought out, and it is subject in my humble opinion to considerable criticism from that angle.

I point out one thing in particular. Let us suppose that at the expiration of the 10 days the resolution automatically comes from the committee. The amendment provides that it shall then become the pending business before the House or Senate and shall be debatable for 10 days. The 10-day period is to be divided, as I understand, equally between the opposing parties. But there is nothing in the amendment at all that would preclude extraneous debate entering into the picture and excluding entirely debate on the resolution which would be before the Senate. The present method of procedure was worked out in the 1939 act, and has been found to operate quite efficiently, and the House has agreed to it. It does much less violence to the rules of the two Houses than the proposed amendment, and in my opinion it would be a mistake for the Senate hurriedly to adopt the amendment instead of adopting the language of the pending bill. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah a question, and at the same time to compliment him on the very able way in which he has handled the pending legislation. I ask the Senator to turn to the bottom of page 11. Section 2 on page 10 provides:

No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

Then at the bottom of page 11—

(h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions; or

And at the top of page 12:

(i) increasing the term of any office beyond that now provided by law for such office.

I was wondering if the Senator could tell us what changes that language would effect. It seems to me that is a more or less wholesale exemption of any agencies that perform quasi-judicial functions, or

are engaged in investigative or rule-making functions, which is, as I see it, a very broad latitude.

Mr. MURDOCK. The thought of the Senate committee, I may inform the Senator, was that any quasi-judicial agency in exercising quasi-judicial functions or rule-making functions should be absolutely independent of, say, a Cabinet officer. The purpose of the committee was that in the event a quasi-judicial agency which is now independent should be placed under a Cabinet officer, notwithstanding that fact the Cabinet officer should in no way interfere with the absolute independence of the quasi-judicial functions or the rule-making functions of such agency.

Mr. President, if subparagraph (h) of section 2 is left in the bill I believe there is a possibility in conference to make the language more definitive, to restrict its meaning, so that it will not have the broad scope it has now, and that we may be able to rewrite subparagraph (h) in such a way that some of the exemptions, or many of them, may be eliminated from the bill, and that full protection may be afforded under the language that may be developed in conference.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the interpretation of the Senator, then, that any agency engaged in quasi-judicial investigative or rule-making functions is exempted from the bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not think that is a fair construction of the language. It may be well to read it.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me that the provision could be couched in more appropriate language. It seems to me to be ambiguous.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us take the Department of Agriculture. We find in that Department the Forest Service, which certainly could be defined under this language as a quasi-judicial agency. In the Department of the Interior we find the General Land Office, which is constantly rendering quasi-judicial decisions respecting land matters.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose the President wanted to recommend the abolition of an office. Let us take the OPA. That is certainly a quasi-judicial agency in the making of all kinds of decisions. The language is:

Divesting any quasi-judicial agency.

If the OPA is abolished it would certainly be divested of the right of doing these things.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the abolition of an agency would not be precluded by this language.

Mr. BYRD. Could not the Senator, who is a very able lawyer—

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Draft a provision which would be clearer? I hesitate to vote for the bill if there is a possibility that that provision would exempt a great number of agencies, because nearly all the agencies of the Government make rules and regulations and have the power of investigation, and so forth. I have a list of such agencies given to me by the Bureau of the Budget. It construes the language to mean that quite a number of agencies would be exempted from the bill if passed in its present form.

Mr. MURDOCK. I doubt that the language is sufficient to exempt an agency. The whole purpose of it is to protect an agency in its independence of functions, so far as quasi-judicial functions and rule making are concerned.

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to protect these bureaus in the matter of authority which they have frequently usurped and taken to themselves with respect to making rules and regulations. That is something in which there has been a great abuse. I do not want to disturb the Senator by offering an amendment, but I do think there ought to be some way to clarify that provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that the language is now too broad in scope, and I am hopeful of improving and correcting it in conference; but I may say to him that I am not ready at this time intelligently to deal with the question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to comment briefly on the amendment, because the question arose at a time when I was present in the subcommittee. It was explained by the chairman of the committee [Mr. MCCARRAN] in this way, as I recall it—and I am sure that this is the interpretation which I obtained at the time as to what was intended by the amendment.

First of all, it was not intended to curtail to any degree whatever the President's power to reorganize the agencies as contemplated by the bill. He could abolish functions and make the reorganization just the same as though the amendment were not in the law. But it was intended that with respect to any such agencies as remained which exercised discretion and judgment, there should be nothing in the plan which would permit any interference with the independent exercise of the discretion and judgment vested in them by law. Frankly, I do not see how a reorganization plan could contain such a thing.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is satisfied with the provision. I am not a member of the committee, and did not hear the argument, but it seems to me that there is a loophole by which many agencies might claim exemption from the Reorganization Act.

Mr. HATCH. I was satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. BYRD. But the explanation is not in the bill. We are voting on certain specified language. The Senator is an able lawyer, and I should like to have him read it and see whether he thinks it exempts quite a number of agencies which are now performing various quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think it exempts them, but I say that if there is any doubt whatever, I join with the Senator from Utah in saying that the language should be clarified, and it should be made certain that it is not intended as an exemption of all agencies.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from New Mexico are

taking a great interest in this subject. Apparently they are satisfied that the language can be changed in conference so as to make it do what it is intended to do.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure it can.

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel that it can.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Dallas, Tex., signed by several bankers. I should like to read it. It is as follows:

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator From Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been called to our attention that the President under the bill which has just passed the House would have the power to abolish the Comptroller's office. This in our opinion would be a very serious mistake. It would place the examination of banks under the Federal Reserve Banking System which would place that institution in a dual position. In a crisis who would they protect, the Federal or the public? The Comptroller's office does not cost the Government anything. The expenses are paid by the banks of this Nation. The Comptroller's office is the only independent agency to which the banks of the country can turn for advice. We hope that when this bill is presented to the Senate that you will so amend it that the President will not have the power to place the banking system of this Nation into politics or destroy the only avenue of the country banks of this Nation. The Comptroller's office reports only to the President of the United States, therefore it is the only independent agency now in force open to the country banks of this Nation.

NATHAN ADAMS.
J. B. ADOUE, JR.
FRED F. FLORENCE.
P. B. GARRETT.
DE WITT T. RAY.
J. C. TENISON.
R. L. THORNTON.

Mr. President, I should like to see the reorganization bill go to the President with no exemptions whatever, permitting the President to reorganize the executive branch of the Government and submit his reorganization plan to both Houses of Congress for ratification, or rejection. But inasmuch as the bill now contains exemptions for 13 or 14 different agencies, and inasmuch as these bankers in Dallas, Tex., seem worried about the authority granted by the bill to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, unless I can have some assurance from those who are handling the bill that the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency is not to be abolished in the reorganization, I should like to include that agency in the exemptions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator propound the question to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I propound the question to the able Senator from Utah as to whether or not, in his opinion, there is any possibility of abolishing the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, the Senator from Utah is not in a position to say what the President of the United States may do. But, in my opinion, the President of the United States, coming from a small town himself, is going to guard just as jealously as any Senator or any Member of the House against anything

that would interfere with our country banks.

We have in the Government today the Federal Reserve System, handling banks. We have the Comptroller of the Currency handling certain functions in connection with our banks. We have the Treasury Department handling certain other functions, and we have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation handling still other functions. It is my opinion that, if there is any part of our Government which needs looking into for the purpose of coordination and reorganization, it is the agencies which handle our banking system. A representative of the FDIC, in the person of Mr. Crowley, appeared before our committee and made the same plea. He said, "If you do not exempt us, you will destroy the small banks of the country." Now we have the same argument used with respect to the Comptroller of the Currency. It is all done in behalf of the small banks.

I come from a small town and all I know about banks is what I know about country banks. Certainly I do not wish to do anything which would in any way interfere with or imperil those banks. I am satisfied that the President of the United States does not wish to injure them in any way. So my answer to the Senator is that, even without exempting the Comptroller of the Currency, we can rest assured that nothing will happen under the present Chief Executive which will in any way be injurious to the country banks. I hope that the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency will not be exempted. It is my opinion that there is plenty of room for coordination and reorganization in the agencies which handle our banks. But if we eliminate all of them, we go down the road with five different agencies of the Government, all handling banks, all of which, except the Federal Reserve System, would be exempt so far as the reorganization bill is concerned.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I understand, the Comptroller of the Currency handles not only the small banks of the Nation but audits the larger banks, the national banks.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true, but I understood that the Senator's argument came from those speaking on behalf of the smaller banks.

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; they are speaking for the larger banks of the Nation. They do not desire a consolidation of governmental agencies when their interests are opposed to it. The Federal Reserve System is one agency. The Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency is an entire different agency, which audits the national banks of the Nation. It would be a serious thing, as they view it, if the auditing of the records of national banks were taken away from this independent agency in the Treasury Department and placed in the Federal Reserve System. The bill as now written would make that possible. The President could do it, and in all good conscience he might think it was the thing to do. So these bankers are worried.

Mr. MURDOCK. The bankers appeared before our committee. Mr. Crowley appeared in behalf of the FDIC. As a

matter of the utmost caution the committee saw fit to exempt the FDIC; but it was my opinion that the argument made for the FDIC was a much better one than could be made for the exemption of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. It is my opinion that in any reorganization or coordination of agencies dealing with the banks we should not exempt all those agencies and permit them to go down the road just as they are today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am compelled to leave the Chamber to attend a committee meeting in a few moments.

Something which was said by the Senator from Utah impels me to leave this comment on the Record: The Senator from Utah has just stated that he thinks there is a better argument for exempting the FDIC than for exempting the other fiscal instrumentalities. I agree with him, and urge that no matter what happens, the FDIC should retain its exemption. I feel that even though no other bureau or agency were exempted, the FDIC ought to be exempted at the present time. In the final analysis, that is the steel beam underneath the popular confidence in our banking system. There is no doubt in the world that it was the FDIC which made it possible for us to sail through the past 10 difficult years without serious banking trouble. The American people are sleeping at nights in regard to their banks. Why? Primarily and fundamentally because of the FDIC.

Mr. President, I think it would be a tragic error to allow anything to be done with the FDIC which might even involve a discussion of what was going on in respect to a change in its set-up. We all know that it has been magnificently operated. It has been brought to the point where it has assets approximating \$1,000,000,000. It is economically managed. There is no necessity to worry about it from a reorganization standpoint; but fundamentally there would be reason to worry about any invitation to the American people to begin suspecting that anyone was starting to change in some fashion the set-up of the FDIC.

I thank the Senator from Texas for permitting me to make this suggestion. I hope that in the course of the discussion of the fiscal agencies and reorganization no one for an instant will think of even approaching a suggestion that the exemption of the FDIC shall not be maintained.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to make a brief reply to the Senator from Michigan. I have known of the distinguished Senator's intense interest in the FDIC ever since I came to the Senate. I wish to say now that there is nothing which the Democratic administration, of which I have been a member, has done that I am prouder of than the enactment of legislation relating to our banks. As the Senator has stated, I think the out-

standing achievement in banking legislation has been the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. As the Senator has so eloquently stated, under the FDIC system the people are not worrying any more about the possibility of bank failures. So far as I recall, in the committee there was no opposition to having the FDIC exempted.

However, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve System, and the Treasury all have a hand in the examination and control of our banking system, and it seems to me we should not absolutely tie the President's hands in dealing with that situation. When we have exempted the FDIC, I think we have gone far enough.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Texas will not offer his amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I also must leave the Chamber, in order to attend a committee meeting. I have asked the Senator to yield to me because I also have received messages and telegrams concerning the exemption of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. In one of the messages the Senator from Texas read there was a statement similar to one contained in a message I have received, namely, that this bill in itself does not transfer the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Federal Reserve System. The idea seems to prevail generally throughout the country that the bill itself will make that change. I arise now merely to state for the RECORD that there is nothing in the bill which will make any change in regard to the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. So far as I know, it may or may not be that some persons think that Bureau should be under the Federal Reserve System; but I am quite sure that nothing in the bill would require such a change.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Of course, Mr. President, the measure under consideration certainly gives the President of the United States the authority to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. In the opinion of the bankers who have telegraphed me and in the opinion of other bankers, the abolition of that Bureau would indeed be a calamity. If the national banks of the country were placed entirely under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve System, there would be no checks or balances; it would all be the Federal Reserve System.

I am wholly in accord with the statements which have been made here by the able and distinguished Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Utah regarding the exclusion of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If any agencies are excluded I think it is wise to exclude that agency from the reorganization plan, because it has certainly performed a worthwhile function in assuring the small depositors that their deposits are safe. But that assurance applies only to deposits of \$5,000 or less. There is no guaranty by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for deposits of more than \$5,000. Many de-

positors have deposits exceeding \$5,000, and they must be able to have confidence in someone or some agency with reference to the security of those larger accounts. They place that confidence in the national banks which hold their deposits. The national banks have a very good reputation. While they do not actually guarantee deposits in excess of \$5,000, their standing is such that in large measure they occupy the same position as that of the FDIC in guaranteeing the smaller deposits. I repeat, the people have confidence in the national banks of this country, and that confidence may be shaken if the Bureau of Comptroller of the Currency is abolished, and its duties of checking the national banks transferred to the Federal Reserve System.

Today there is some discussion relative to consolidating the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency with the Federal Reserve System. The bankers to whom I have referred think that would be a calamity, and therefore they have telegraphed me stating their reasons for urging the retention of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency as an independent agency. Their position is that unless assurance can be given that the Bureau of Comptroller of the Currency will not be abolished by the reorganization plan, and amendment prohibiting the abolishment of that agency should be offered.

Inasmuch as I am unable to obtain such assurance I offer an amendment prohibiting the abolition of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, and I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, in line 20, after the comma, it is proposed to insert:

Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I now move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4129.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now move that all after the enacting clause of House bill 4129 be stricken out, and that the committee amendment, as amended, of Senate bill 1120 be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Austin | Hart | O'Daniel |
| Ball | Hatch | O'Mahoney |
| Barkley | Hawkes | Radcliffe |
| Bilbo | Hayden | Reed |
| Brewster | Hickenlooper | Revercomb |
| Bridges | Hill | Robertson |
| Buck | Hoey | Russell |
| Bushfield | Huffman | Shipstead |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | Smith |
| Byrd | Johnston, S. C. | Stewart |
| Capper | Knowland | Taft |
| Carville | La Follette | Taylor |
| Chavez | Lucas | Thomas, Okla. |
| Connally | McCarran | Tobey |
| Cordon | McClellan | Tunnell |
| Dcnnell | McFarland | Tydings |
| Downey | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Eastland | McMahon | Wagner |
| Ellender | Maybank | Walsh |
| Ferguson | Mead | Wheeler |
| Fulbright | Millikin | White |
| George | Mitchell | Wiley |
| Gerry | Moore | Wilson |
| Green | Morse | Young |
| Guffey | Murdock | |
| Gurney | Myers | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4129) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, will be indefinitely postponed.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT RELATING TO INCOME TAX LAWS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF WORLD WAR II

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 102, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II" be printed with illustrations, as a public document, and that 12,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 10,000 shall be for the House document room and 2,000 for the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate just exactly what this is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The concurrent resolution authorizes the printing of a public document providing information for veterans with respect to income tax laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

**LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS—
STATEMENT BY NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE COUNCIL**

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on November 18 a release covering the subject of labor-management problems was made public by the Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo, chairman of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council.

I look with favor upon suggestions of this character which have to do with the development of advanced ideas in the field of labor-management relations. Because of the importance of this news release, and because of the originality of the suggestions which it contains, I should like to have it made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wish to point out particularly two paragraphs which I think are very interesting. I read from the statement:

The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

The statement says further:

Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact-finding be set up to reinforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining, and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; * * * These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

Mr. President, this suggestion is built around the possibility of setting up fact-finding boards which would not be directly associated with the conciliation or the arbitration or the collective bargaining agency, but would be independent, separate, and distinct, and would bring out the facts after consultation with both sides to the dispute, or all sides to the dispute, and make the facts available to those who have to do with the work of arbitrating or mediating or conciliating disputes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from New York about compulsory arbitration. From what study I have given the subject, compulsory arbitration is something which theoretically is very appealing, but as a practical solution would not be workable, for the very reason the Senator has mentioned, namely, it would

start a dictatorship if we compelled men on the one hand or industry on the other to do something which they thought would in the end bring ruin on either. I have come to the conclusion that, in spite of the appeal of compulsory arbitration, I do not believe forcible settlement can be achieved without potential liabilities which far outweigh any temporary advantages if that policy should be promulgated and continued.

However, there is one phase of the present labor difficulties about which I should like to see something constructive done. I do not know that I am accurate in my facts, but one gains the impression that when labor and management, through collective bargaining, enter into a contract, and management then breaks the contract, labor has the right to strike, and no one would want to take that right away from labor. On the other hand, if labor breaks its contract and refuses to work, so to speak, under the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement, there does not seem to be any redress for the owner of the plant, or the management. Has the Senator given any thought to that phase of the present difficulties?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion, which is substantiated by reports which are drifting into the public press, that that is one of the questions now being considered.

Of course, in all contractual obligations we naturally subscribe to the theory that, once a contract is made, it should be carried out by both parties; but there are many provisions in contracts which subject themselves to multitudinous interpretations, such as cost-of-living requirements, and failure on the part of the contractor to secure sufficient orders to keep his employees together.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there is reasonable ground for difference of opinion, but let us suppose there are a thousand men in a plant, and, for the purposes of the illustration, let us suppose it is a closed shop, and that through collective bargaining a contract is entered into. Let us suppose that 200 men go on a strike unauthorized by the union, in other words, the union itself or its officials do not authorize the strike, but, so far as the company is concerned, the 200 men being in key positions, by striking have perhaps paralyzed the whole plant.

I think that in a case such as the one I have suggested, or one related to it, management is entitled to more protection than the present law gives it. I have noticed something along this line leaking out from the conference now taking place. Certainly if management were to declare a lock-out in violation of a contract it would be held up to censure, and properly so.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. If 200 men who have agreed not to strike because conditions are satisfactory go out on a strike, unless the union orders it, it seems to me management reciprocally should be entitled, in such a case, to some redress. There is a void in the law, so far as that phase of labor-management relations is

concerned. Does the Senator agree with me generally?

Mr. MEAD. I think generally the Senator's statement is correct, but he must remember that there are probably many difficulties which result in injustice to the workers, which have been perpetrated upon them by certain elements of the management class. For instance, it was my obligation to make an investigation of production in the automotive trade, and while on the surface it appeared that the workers were either slowing up or holding up war production, many acts of management could be advanced as reasons behind the work stoppage or slowing up. There are a thousand and one ramifications, but they are generally based upon the ideal condition the Senator presents. Throughout the war it was demonstrated in many cases that the labor leadership of the country came to the support of management in breaking so-called outlaw strikes, and in maintaining proper contractual relations.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator, and it is not an easy situation to handle. My point refers to cases where there is the right of collective bargaining, and management and labor enter into an agreement, and the union, which is the bargaining agent, does not consider the point raised, whatever the dispute may be, sufficient to warrant calling a strike or a real violation of the contract, and therefore it does not order a strike, but, nevertheless, a substantial number of employees strike anyway, indulging in what labor and management have frequently called wildcat strikes, and management stands helpless, even though the labor unions are cooperating with it trying to get the men back into the plant.

I do not believe it is fair to leave the situation in that shape. I have no solution to suggest, but I am hopeful that the present conference will devise one, because it has seemed to me that a case like that presents one of the justifiable complaints which management has had, namely, that if they enter into a contract with a union in good faith, make a hard and fast contract, and the union itself feels satisfied as a whole that the conditions are good, no group should be allowed to break a contract which was entered into for that group's protection.

Mr. MEAD. As I said before, we have had excellent demonstrations of the patriotic efforts of labor leaders to suppress outlaw strikes, such as the Senator has mentioned, especially during the war period. We also have information that this subject is now receiving attention by the labor-management conference. I am sure we are both concerned that no legislation shall be enacted which will in any way deny to the individual the economic freedom which should go with citizenship. That is, we cannot force an individual to sell his labor against his free will. Solution of the problem is difficult, but it occurs to me that by setting up a fact-finding board, such as that recommended in the press release of the National Catholic Welfare Council, there may be the possibility of an avenue of approach so that when the facts are developed, and are made known to both sides and to the public, the number of

strikes which do not carry with them the support of public opinion may be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. President, I will say that I really believe this is one of the most important domestic problems in our democracy, and I am glad to see that colleges and universities are taking up the subject and are organizing schools on management-labor relationships. I think it will result in a great deal of good. The Senator from Maryland will probably recall a recent utterance by Mr. Tobin, the president of the teamsters' union, in which he called attention to the fact that as a rule labor loses tremendously by strikes, except when it is absolutely necessary that they gain recognition, and thus, as sometimes happens, become able to eliminate a serious injustice that could only be eliminated by strikes.

I point out that it would be much better if these gains could be acquired without the economic losses which are sustained by the workers as a result of long-drawn-out strikes. So labor along with management is looking for the opportunity to settle difficulties in a more orderly manner than has been invoked in many cases in the past.

I think so highly of the statement because of the fact that it brings a new element of thought into the consideration of this problem, that I now ask to have it made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, November 18, 1945.

The following letter was sent today to the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor and to Judge Walter P. Stacy, chairman, Labor-Management Conference:

"The Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to make a suggestion to the Department of Labor of the United States and to the Labor-Management Conference.

"The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

"The other fact is that methods of conciliation and voluntary arbitration often lack that thorough knowledge of the facts underlying the disputes which normally is necessary for a just agreement or a just decision.

"Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact finding be set up to reinforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining, and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; that the fact finding be in the hands of a board representative of neither side of the dispute but representative of, as far as possible, impartial members of the public; that the President of the United States or the Secretary of Labor appoint them; that as many boards, national, regional, or local, be set up as are required to aid in the settlement of major disputes; that these fact-finding bodies be instructed to report quickly; and that they receive statements from both sides in the dispute and from other competent witnesses; and have available all the pertinent knowledge which the Federal or State governments possess.

These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

"Threats of major strikes now loom. Other strikes seem to be in the offing. Others will occur after this present period ends. We recommend this fact-finding procedure both for current disputes and for the future. The facts will furnish ground for just agreements in collective bargaining and just decisions in arbitration.

"We consider this proposal both as a way to help settle current disputes and as a permanent policy of the American Government and the governments of the States. We do not contemplate this procedure except in important cases.

"The usefulness of these boards depends upon their being established early in a dispute and upon the speed of their action. Delayed statements of fact would be calamitous.

"We think that there are enough honest and capable persons in our country to man these boards in the interest of the general good.

"Sincerely yours,

"KARL J. ALTER,

"Chairman, Social Action Department,
"N. C. W. C., Bishop of Toledo."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think I am in general agreement with the philosophy of the Senator from New York on this particular matter, and likewise I have looked with a great deal of approval upon the recent statements of President Truman that one of the most dangerous things that could ever happen to labor would be for the Nation to have what might be called a national wage policy under which everyone's wages more or less would be fixed arbitrarily by the Federal Government. That might in the beginning appeal to labor, but in the end it would simply mean that jurisdiction would be taken of the whole field of wages, and if we ever adopt such a policy labor could not strike without striking against the law, and the law would be there until repealed. So when individuals are appealing to the administration that it fix a particular wage standard, so-called, they are giving hostages to fortune on the road to dictatorship, for the same reason the Senator advanced when he said that compulsory arbitration would also lead in that direction.

I am glad that the administration has not fallen into that error, because in my opinion labor eventually would be hurt more than anyone else if such a policy were carried into effect.

Mr. MEAD. If we set up the machinery for the settlement of disputes, if we give to the participants all the information and all the knowledge necessary for the effective settlement of disputes, and then if we maintain in this democratic country of ours real democracy in the settlement of industrial disputes based upon the freedom of the worker, I believe we will become the outstanding example to the industrial nations of the world.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4407, reducing certain

appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes. I will state that I make the motion for the purpose of having the bill become the unfinished business, and not with an expectation that it will be taken up this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent further, as is customary in connection with a bill of this kind, that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 674, House bill 2851, to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the City of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2851) to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have conferred with certain minority members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and as the result of the conference I beg leave to state that there is no objection offered on this side of the Chamber to immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851), which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 6, line 6, after the word "compensation", to strike out "without regard to" and to insert "in accordance with the provisions of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, after the word "laws", to strike out "or", and insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "Any appropriations for the National Park Service not exceeding \$25,000 and moneys which may be donated for the purposes of this act shall

be available for the necessary expenses of such investigation", and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000 to carry out the provisions of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASE OF PAY OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I offered on the floor of the Senate a measure seeking to increase the pay of the men in the armed services. It was voted down by a disappointingly large vote. I based my argument in part for the necessity of such an increase upon the obvious fact that it would increase voluntary enlistments. I think that everything which has transpired in connection with Army service since that date has verified the soundness of my amendment. Those who are opposed to a volunteer army do not want to increase the pay of our soldiers. I repeat today, Mr. President, that I do not think we are going to be able to raise by way of voluntary enlistment the Army which we need to do the police job that is needed to be done in various parts of the world unless we correct the pay injustice that men wearing the uniform of the United States Army today are suffering. Not only are the soldiers suffering a wage injustice but their families are suffering as the result of not being allowed adequate allotments to take care of those families while the men are in the service. I have many letters from wives and parents of servicemen describing the great hardships that are resulting from the pittance now allowed many needy cases.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I remember when the Senator made his proposal, but the amount of increase provided for is not in my mind.

Mr. MORSE. At that particular time I suggested that in order to show our good faith in the matter we propose a token increase of \$25 per month, with the understanding that we would take the matter under advisement and investigation and determine how much more ought to be allowed in order to give these men a fair day's pay for a fair day's work which they are performing for the people of the United States while serving in the Army during the postwar period.

Mr. STEWART. That would be a total of about \$75 a month for the average GI?

Mr. MORSE. Plus the subsistence allowances he receives.

Mr. STEWART. That means the base pay. The base pay today is \$50.

Mr. MORSE. It would be \$75 under my proposed amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Did the Senator ask for an increase in subsistence pay for the family of the GI?

Mr. MORSE. Not in that particular amendment, although the RECORD will show that I spoke in behalf of the need of such a thing being done in connection with the study which I proposed with regard to the whole question of servicemen's pay.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator's amendment refers to new enlistees, or those who would remain in the Regular Army.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator contemplate the payment of more money to those who would serve overseas during the period of occupation than to those who would serve in this country during that time?

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied that the committee which would investigate the matter would find upon a careful analysis of the facts that it should bring back just such a recommendation—that there should be an extra increase in pay for the man himself while serving overseas.

Mr. STEWART. In the main I am inclined to be in sympathy with the Senator's amendment. I think we ought to do all we can to encourage volunteers in this particular period. The more we do along that line the nearer we can come to settling the problem of further drafting of young boys.

Mr. MORSE. The reason I make any comment at all on the subject today is that the same argument was made at the time I offered my amendment for increasing soldiers' pay that is usually made in the Congress of the United States when the Congress wishes to do something inadequate as of the moment, and yet put off final determination of the merits of the basic issue involved in a proposal until a later date. The usual argument was made that the subject ought to be taken under consideration, and that more time ought to be devoted to it than could be devoted by the Senate on the day when I proposed the amendment for the immediate consideration of this body.

Such inquiry as I have been able to make leads me to make the statement that nothing has been done by any committee of the Senate since the matter was under discussion, and I am satisfied that nothing will be done until we begin, by such procedure as I am starting to adopt this afternoon, to arouse the people of the country to the fact that their Congress is not doing anything so far as making an investigation of Army pay rates is concerned. I submit that the Congress should be conducting a careful investigation regarding adequate pay for the men in the armed services, and in regard to giving a decent allotment to the families of those men, who at the present time, in large numbers, are suffering unnecessary and unjustifiable hardship because the Government of the United States is not awarding them decent allotments so that they can maintain themselves in self-respect

and decency while the male members of their families are serving in the uniform of the United States.

My mail shows—as does the editorial which I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks—that men in the armed forces are perfectly aware of the injustice which they and their families are suffering in regard to Army pay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Higher Pay and Allotments for Service Men," published in the Stars and Stripes, mid-Pacific edition, of November 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER PAY AND ALLOTMENTS FOR SERVICEMEN

There has been much talk recently of raising the wages of mainland civilian workers in order that take-home pay may be held at something approaching wartime levels.

The Stars and Stripes suggests that any such wage increases be accompanied by reasonable increases in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments.

The United Automobile Workers Union has asked a 30-percent boost in basic wage rates.

Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., may agree to a 15-percent increase for Ford workers.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace has suggested a 15-percent increase in wages and around a 10-percent increase in manufactured-goods prices.

The higher wages, it is argued, are to come out of increased production efficiency, business savings due to lower taxes, and higher prices.

The Stars and Stripes does not wish to enter the dispute over whether or not the wage increases can be justified. That is a matter to be settled by genuine collective bargaining between unions and management, with impartial assistance from Government.

But the Stars and Stripes does wish to make the point that if wages of civilian workers are to go up—10, 20, 30 percent—and if prices are to go up as well, then the serviceman's pay and his dependency allotment should be raised correspondingly.

If, in the national economic picture, civilian wage increases, with accompanying price rises, can be justified, then surely a similar increase in the soldier's, sailor's, and marine's pay is no more than fair.

To be sure, the serviceman has no union to bargain for him, and rightly so. But, if Army and Navy careers, whether for a lifetime or only a year, are to be made as attractive as civilian jobs, and especially if voluntary enlistments are to amount to much, someone must see to it that the financial rewards of the man who chooses to remain in the service of his country keep pace with what he might be making as a civilian. The waiving of income tax on wartime service of EM is merely a step in the right direction.

Dependents of servicemen have to pay for food, housing, clothing, transportation, and recreation in the same markets as other civilians, the price level, if it goes up, will affect everybody at home, not just those who get the higher wages.

The Stars and Stripes has no intention of driving a wedge between civilian wage earners and servicemen and their dependents. That would be foolish because most servicemen are wage earners at heart and want nothing so much as to get back into overalls.

We are merely putting in a bid for readjustments in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments commensurate with any widespread increase in civilian wage rates.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take this occasion to say that it is my judgment that servicemen are not going to get justice on this issue until they start to make their demands upon the Congress understood by language as to which there can be no misunderstanding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of sundry postmasters which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wallace S. Gourley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania;

William McClanahan, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee; and

John P. Logan, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Freer to be Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Alice Y. Brown, Hercules, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mildred H. Moran, Spring Valley, Calif., in place of R. P. Wilson, resigned.

IOWA

Leadayle I. Brayton, Somers, Iowa, in place of H. W. Hesser, removed.

KENTUCKY

Ida Sanders, Dorton, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bessie De P. Givens, Dunmore, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Conda L. Gurley, Insull, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Kathryne S. Doggett, Blanchard, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bettye R. Kemp, Ethel, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Audrey N. Evans, Jamestown, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John L. Richard, St. Gabriel, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Paul E. Teifer, Trenton, Mich., in place of E. N. Moroney, removed.

MINNESOTA

Donald Krey Grant, Wyoming, Minn., in place of W. D. Banta, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Josephine Agnes Washkewicz, Hainesport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

A. Eloise Maness, Star, N. C., in place of T. L. Maness, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

William A. Gamble, Edgeley, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Ravelly, resigned.

Josephine McLauchlin, Sanish, N. Dak., in place of H. H. Bugge, transferred.

John Wiedmann, Venturia, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Weldon C. Keller, Vida, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ethel E. Morris, Modena, Pa., in place of C. L. Wagner, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Silvestre G. Gonzalez, Lares, P. R., in place of Ricardo Mendez, Jr., resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Myron J. Cannon, Hermosa, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Walter L. Wiseman, La Vernia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James B. Pitman, Muldoon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Albert L. Van Alstine, New London, Wis., in place of Jacob Werner, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Robert E. Freer, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Earline Jarman, Cuba.
Arthur A. Burgess, Winfield.

MISSOURI

Morris S. Major, Mountain Grove.

NEBRASKA

Irma M. Davis, Weston.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marie M. Bassler, Brockton.
Charles J. Tumelty, Broomall.
John W. Wasil, Calumet.
Margaret M. Reddy, Connerton.
Howard E. Gilfillan, Conoquenessing.
Vesta Y. Stevens, Flinton.
Anthony Cickavage, Frackville.
I. Elizabeth Clark, Graterford.
Mayme S. Porter, Hokendauqua.
Charles Fralley, Minisink Hills.
Dorothy M. Steuart, Salina.
Bette M. Logan, West Monterey.
Rocco Moff, Weston.
Francis T. McMahon, Wyncote.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, as we wait at the altar of prayer, we invoke Thy blessing of peace and guidance upon all who take counsel together. Grant that the wisest thought may quicken all who are associated with the Congress, consuming the dross of unworthy ambition and giving implicit trust and a perpetual hope in the deliberations. We beseech Thee to make all hearts receptive to the deep truth that freedom is determined only by the will of a free people. We praise Thee that man's true value is reckoned far above the things born of earth and clings to those ideals which are a part of our national heritage. Thou, whose presence is the gift of peace, dwell in us, that our difficulties may provide the materials for wise achievements and contribute to the upbuilding of Thy kingdom in human relations. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 16, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The message also announced that the PRESIDENT pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain